arXiv:0912.2500v1 [math.SG] 13 Dec 2009

REMOVAL OF SINGULARITIES AND GROMOV COMPACTNESS FOR SYMPLECTIC VORTICES

ANDREAS OTT

Abstract. We prove that the moduli space of gauge equivalence classes of symplectic vortices with uniformly bounded energy in a compact Hamiltonian manifold admits a Gromov compactification by polystable vortices. This extends results of Mundet i Riera and Tian for circle actions to the case of arbitrary compact Lie groups. Our argument relies on an a priori estimate for vortices that allows us to apply techniques used by McDuff and Salamon in their proof of Gromov compactness for pseudoholomorphic curves. As an intermediate result we prove a removable singularity theorem for vortices.

1. Introduction and main results

For any compact Lie group G and any Hamiltonian G-manifold (M, ω, μ) with moment map $\mu\colon M \to \mathfrak{g}$, Cieliebak, Gaio, and Salamon [2], [1], [4] and Mundet i Riera and Tian [17], [18], [1], [19] studied the symplectic vortex equations

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A}(u) = 0, \qquad F_A + \mu(u)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = 0$$

for pairs (A, u), where A is a connection on a fixed G-bundle P over a compact Riemann surface Σ equipped with a fixed complex structure and a fixed area form dvol_Σ, u is a G-equivariant map $P \to M$, and $J\colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ is a family of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M. Solutions of these equations are called vortices and may be regarded as gauge-theoretic deformations of J-holomorphic curves in M. For proper moment map μ and M equivariantly convex at infinity, Cieliebak et. al. [1] proved that the moduli space of gauge equivalence classes of vortices with uniformly bounded energy is compact under the additional assumption that M is symplectically aspherical. The latter condition means that the symplectic form ω vanishes on all spherical homology classes in M and ensures that no bubbling occurs. If it is dropped, one may construct a compactification of the moduli space by means of polystable vortices in a way similar to the Gromov compactification of the moduli space of pseudoholomorphic curves [8], [14], [10], [20], [24], [11], [16]. This was first carried out by Mundet i Riera [18] for $G = S^1$ and fixed complex structure on Σ, using the compactness results for pseudoholomorphic curves of Ivashkovich and Shevchishin [12] (see also Siebert and Tian [21]). Later Mundet i Riera and Tian [19] constructed a compactification for $G = S^1$ also for varying complex structure on Σ.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37J15, 53D20, 53D45, 58J05.

The author was supported by ETH Research Grant TH-01 06-1.

In this article we prove Gromov compactness for symplectic vortices (Theorem 1.8) for an arbitrary compact Lie group G and fixed complex structure on Σ, applying the techniques used by McDuff and Salamon [16] in the context of pseudoholomorphic curves. This result crucially relies on a removable singularity theorem for vortices on the punctured unit disc (Theorem 1.1).

The result of this article is part of a joint project with E. González, C. Woodward, and F. Ziltener [5] which is concerned with the study of vortices with fixed holonomy at infinity on punctured Riemann surfaces with fixed complex structure for arbitrary compact Lie groups G, with the goal of defining the corresponding gauged Gromov-Witten invariants for convex Hamiltonian G-manifolds. Moreover, the Gromov compactification constructed in this article is used by González and Woodward [6], [7] to define gauged Gromov-Witten invariants for smooth projective G-varieties.

We now state the two main theorems of this article. Let G be a compact Lie group. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of G, equipped with a fixed G-invariant inner product denoted by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$. Let (M,ω,μ) be a compact Hamiltonian G-manifold with symplectic form ω and moment map $\mu\colon M\to\mathfrak{g}^*\cong\mathfrak{g}$, where we identify the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ with its dual $\mathfrak{g}^*$ by means of the invariant inner product on $\mathfrak{g}$. The action of G on M gives rise to an infinitesimal action of $\mathfrak{g}$ on M, and we denote by X_ξ the Hamiltonian vector field on M associated to the element $\xi\in\mathfrak{g}$. We denote by $\mathcal{J}_G(M,\omega)$ the space of smooth G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M.

Our first result is a removable singularity theorem for vortices on the punctured disc. Denote by $B\subset\mathbb{C}$ the closed unit disc, and write the coordinate on $\mathbb{C}$ as $z=s+\mathrm{i}\,t$. Fix a smooth family $J\colon B\to\mathcal{J}_G(M,\omega)$ of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M and a smooth function $\lambda\colon B\to(0,\infty)$. We denote the corresponding family of Riemannian metrics on M by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_J:=\omega(\cdot,J\cdot)$. The **symplectic vortex equations** on the punctured unit disc are the system of nonlinear partial differential equations

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_s u+X_\Phi(u)+J\big(\partial_t u+X_\Psi(u)\big)&=0\\ \partial_s\Psi-\partial_t\Phi+[\Phi,\Psi]+\lambda^2\,\mu(u)&=0,\end{aligned}\tag{1.1}$$

where $\Phi,\Psi\colon B\setminus\{0\}\to\mathfrak{g}$ are smooth functions and $u\colon B\setminus\{0\}\to M$ is a smooth map. A triple (Φ,Ψ,u) that solves equations (1.1) will be called a **vortex**. We define the **Yang-Mills-Higgs energy** of a vortex (Φ,Ψ,u) by

$$E(\Phi,\Psi,u):=\int_B\Big(\big|\partial_s u+X_\Phi(u)\big|_J^2+\lambda^2\,\big|\mu(u)\big|_{\mathfrak{g}}^2\Big)\,\mathrm{d}s\wedge\mathrm{d}t,\tag{1.2}$$

where the norms are understood with respect to the metric $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_J$ on M and the inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$. Note that this energy may be infinite.

Theorem 1.1 (Removal of singularities)**.** *Let* (Φ, Ψ, u) *be a smooth vortex on the punctured disc* $B \setminus \{0\}$*, and assume that the following holds.*

(i) Φ *and* Ψ *extend continuously to all of* B*.*

(ii) (Φ, Ψ, u) *has finite Yang-Mills-Higgs energy* $E(\Phi, \Psi, u) < \infty$*.*

Then u *is of class* $W^{1,p}$ *on* B *for every real number* $p > 2$*.*

We will prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 3. This result will play a crucial role in the proof of Gromov compactness for vortices.

Remark 1.2. Assumption (i) in Theorem 1.1 implies that the limit holonomy at 0 of the singular connection $\Phi\, \mathrm{d}s + \Psi\, \mathrm{d}t$ on the punctured disc $B \setminus \{0\}$ is trivial.

The main result of this article is Theorem 1.8 below, which establishes Gromov compactness for vortices. Before we can state it we need to introduce some notation.

We first recall from Section 2 in Cieliebak et. al. [1] the definition of the symplectic vortex equations on compact Riemann surfaces. Let Σ be a compact Riemann surface endowed with a fixed complex structure j_Σ and a fixed area form dvol_Σ. Let $\pi \colon P \to \Sigma$ be a fixed principal G-bundle. Let $J \colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ be a smooth family of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M. As before, we denote the corresponding family of Riemannian metrics on M by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_J := \omega(\cdot, J \cdot)$. We shall write $\mathcal{A}(P)$ for the space of smooth connections on P and $C^\infty_G(P, M)$ for the space of smooth G-equivariant maps $P \to M$. For any pair $(A, u) \in \mathcal{A}(P) \times C^\infty_G(P, M)$ we denote by

$$\mathrm{d}_A u := \mathrm{d}u + X_A(u)$$

the twisted derivative of u and define the corresponding nonlinear Cauchy-Riemann operator by

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A}(u) := \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{d}_A u + J(u) \circ \mathrm{d}_A u \circ j_\Sigma\right).$$

The **symplectic vortex equations** on the Riemann surface Σ are the system of nonlinear partial differential equations

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A}(u) = 0, \qquad F_A + \mu(u)\, \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = 0 \tag{1.3}$$

for pairs $(A, u) \in \mathcal{A}(P) \times C^\infty_G(P, M)$, where F_A denotes the curvature form of the connection A. Its solutions are called **vortices**. We define the **Yang-Mills-Higgs energy** of a vortex (A, u) on an open subset $U \subset \Sigma$ by

$$E(A, u; U) := \int_U \left(\frac{1}{2}\left|\mathrm{d}_A u\right|_J^2 + \left|\mu(u)\right|_{\mathfrak{g}}^2\right) \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma,$$

and write $E(A, u)$ for the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of (A, u) on Σ. The norms appearing in this definition are understood with respect to the metric on Σ determined by the area form dvol_Σ and the complex structure j_Σ, the metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_J$ on M, and the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$, respectively.

Remark 1.3. Equations (1.1) are a local version of equations (1.3) in the following sense. Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be an open subset of $\mathbb{C}$, and let $\varphi\colon \mathbb{C} \supset D \to \Sigma$ be a holomorphic chart map which trivializes the bundle P. Fix a lift $\widetilde{\varphi}\colon D \to P$ of this map. A vortex (A, u) satisfying equations (1.3) determines a smooth triple $(\Phi, \Psi, u^{\mathrm{loc}})$ on D by the relations

$$\widetilde{\varphi}^* A = \Phi \,\mathrm{d}s + \Psi \,\mathrm{d}t \quad \text{and} \quad u^{\mathrm{loc}} = u \circ \widetilde{\varphi}.$$

The area form dvol_Σ gives rise to a smooth function $\lambda\colon D \to (0, \infty)$ by

$$\varphi^* \,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = \lambda^2 \,\mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t.$$

A short calculation (see [1], Proposition 2.2) now shows that the triple $(\Phi, \Psi, u^{\mathrm{loc}})$ satisfies the vortex equations

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s u^{\mathrm{loc}} + X_\Phi\big(u^{\mathrm{loc}}\big) + (J \circ \varphi)\big(\partial_t u^{\mathrm{loc}} + X_\Psi\big(u^{\mathrm{loc}}\big)\big) &= 0 \\ \partial_s \Psi - \partial_t \Phi + [\Phi, \Psi] + \lambda^2 \mu\big(u^{\mathrm{loc}}\big) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

on D. Moreover, the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy density of $(\Phi, \Psi, u^{\mathrm{loc}})$ can be expressed in terms of (A, u) by

$$\big|\partial_s u^{\mathrm{loc}} + X_\Phi\big(u^{\mathrm{loc}}\big)\big|_J^2 + \lambda^2 \big|\mu\big(u^{\mathrm{loc}}\big)\big|^2 = \left(\frac{1}{2}\big|\mathrm{d}_A u \circ \widetilde{\varphi}\big|_{J\circ\varphi}^2 + \big|\mu(u \circ \widetilde{\varphi})\big|^2\right) \cdot \lambda^2, \tag{1.4}$$

and the Yang-Mills-Higgs energies of $(\Phi, \Psi, u^{\mathrm{loc}})$ and (A, u) are related by

$$E\big(\Phi, \Psi, u^{\mathrm{loc}}; D\big) = E\big(A, u; \varphi(D)\big). \tag{1.5}$$

This justifies the ad hoc definitions at the beginning of this section.

Next we introduce polystable vortices and give a precise definition of Gromov convergence for a sequence of vortices. We begin by recalling some basic facts about trees and nodal curves from McDuff and Salamon [16], Section D.2, modifying the notation and terminology a little. A **tree** is a directed connected graph without cycles. We will denote it by (V, E), where V is a finite set of vertices and $E \subset V \times V$ is the edge relation. A rooted tree is a tree (V, E) which has a distinguished **root vertex** $0 \in V$. We will indicate this in the notation by writing the set of vertices V as a disjoint union

$$V = \{0\} \sqcup V_S.$$

The elements of V_S are called **spherical vertices**. Note that V always contains the root vertex 0 whereas V_S may be empty. Let n be a nonnegative integer. An **n-labeled tree** is a triple $T = (V, E, \Lambda)$ consisting of a rooted tree $(V = \{0\} \sqcup V_S, E)$ and a labeling

$$\Lambda\colon \{1, \ldots, n\} \longrightarrow V, \qquad i \mapsto \alpha_i.$$

Given an n-labeled tree $T = (V = \{0\} \sqcup V_S, E, \Lambda)$, we mean by a normalized nodal curve of combinatorial type T a tuple

$$(\mathbf{\Sigma}, \mathbf{z}) := \big(\{\Sigma_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in V}, \{z_{\alpha\beta}\}_{\alpha E \beta}, \{\alpha_i, z_i\}_{1 \le i \le n}\big),$$

often just written as

$$\mathbf{z} = \big(\{z_{\alpha\beta}\}_{\alpha E \beta}, \{\alpha_i, z_i\}_{1 \le i \le n}\big),$$

consisting of a compact Riemann surface Σ_0, called the **principal component** associated to the root vertex 0, a **spherical component** $\Sigma_\alpha := \mathbb{P}^1$ for every $\alpha \in V_S$, nodal points $z_{\alpha\beta} \in \Sigma_\alpha$ labeled by the directed edges $\alpha E \beta$ of T, and n distinct marked points $z_i \in \Sigma_{\alpha_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, such that for every $\alpha \in V$, the points $z_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\alpha E \beta$ and z_i for $\alpha_i = \alpha$ are pairwise distinct. For $\alpha \in V$ we denote the set of nodal points on the component Σ_α by

$$Z_\alpha := \{z_{\alpha\beta} \,|\, \alpha E \beta\},$$

and we define the set of special points on Σ_α by

$$Y_\alpha := Z_\alpha \cup \{z_i \,|\, \alpha_i = \alpha\}.$$

If two vertices $\alpha, \beta \in V$ are not connected by an edge, denote by $z_{\alpha\beta}$ the unique nodal point on Σ_α which corresponds to the first edge on the chain running from α to β. As a special case of this, we define the point z_{0i} on the principal component Σ_0 to be

$$z_{0i} := \begin{cases} z_i & \text{if } \alpha_i = 0, \\ z_{0\alpha_i} & \text{if } \alpha_i \in V_S \end{cases}$$

In other words, if z_i lies on a spherical component, then z_{0i} is the unique nodal point on the principal component at which the bubble tree containing z_i is attached. Otherwise, z_{0i} coincides with z_i.

We shall denote by $P(M) := (P \times M)/G \to \Sigma$ the symplectic fiber bundle associated to the G-bundle $P \to \Sigma$ and the G-manifold M.

Remark 1.4. We may equivalently think of a G-equivariant map $u \colon P \to M$ as a section $u \colon \Sigma \to P(M)$. In fact, this section is defined by

$$\Sigma \ni z \mapsto [p, u(p)] \in P(M), \quad \pi(p) = z,$$

where $\pi \colon P \to \Sigma$ is the bundle projection. We will usually not distinguish between these two viewpoints in the notation and switch freely from one to the other, depending on the situation.

We are now in a position to give the definition of Gromov convergence for a sequence of vortices. Our definition is adapted from the definition of Gromov convergence for sequences of pseudoholomorphic curves in McDuff and Salamon [16], Section 5.2. Similar definitions of Gromov convergence for vortices were given before by Mundet i Riera [18], González and Woodward [5], [6], [7], and Ziltener [26].

Definition 1.5 (Polystable vortices)**.** Fix a smooth family $J \colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M, and a complex structure j_Σ and an area form dvol_Σ on Σ. Let n be a nonnegative integer, and let $T = (V = \{0\} \sqcup V_S, E, \Lambda)$ be an n-labeled tree. A **polystable vortex of combinatorial type** T is a tuple

$$(A, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}) := \big((A, u_0), \{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in V_S}, \{z_{\alpha\beta}\}_{\alpha E \beta}, \{\alpha_i, z_i\}_{1 \le i \le n}\big)$$

consisting of

- a normalized nodal curve $\big(\{\Sigma_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in V}, \{z_{\alpha\beta}\}_{\alpha E\beta}, \{\alpha_i, z_i\}_{1\le i\le n}\big)$ of combinatorial type T with principal component $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma$;
- a vortex (A, u_0) on the principal component Σ_0;
- a $J_{z_{0\alpha}}$-holomorphic curve $u_\alpha\colon \Sigma_\alpha \to P(M)_{z_{0\alpha}}$ in the fiber of $P(M)$ over the nodal point $z_{0\alpha} \in \Sigma_0$ for every $\alpha \in V_S$

such that the following conditions are satisfied.

(Connectedness) $u_\alpha(z_{\alpha\beta}) = u_\beta(z_{\beta\alpha})$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in V$ such that $\alpha E\beta$.

(Polystability) $|Y_\alpha| \ge 3$ for all $\alpha \in V_S$ such that u_α is constant.

To understand the meaning of the (Connectedness) condition in the case $\alpha = 0$, we think of the G-equivariant map $u_0\colon P \to M$ as a section $u_0\colon \Sigma \to P(M)$ as explained in Remark 1.4. The (Connectedness) condition then means that $u_0(z_{0\beta}) = u_\beta(z_{\beta 0})$ in the fiber of $P(M)$ over the nodal point $z_{0\beta} \in \Sigma_0$.

Remark 1.6. The $J_{z_{0\alpha}}$-holomorphic curves $u_\alpha\colon \Sigma_\alpha \to P(M)_{z_{0\alpha}}$ are also called **spherical fiber bubbles**. Fixing an identification $P(M)_{z_{0\alpha}} \cong M$, they may be regarded as ordinary $J_{z_{0\alpha}}$-holomorphic curves $\Sigma_\alpha \to M$. To make this more precise, for each point $p \in P$ we define a trivialization of the fiber of the bundle $P(M)$ over the point $\pi(p)$ by

$$\iota_p\colon M \xrightarrow{\cong} P(M)_{\pi(p)} = P_{\pi(p)} \times_G M, \quad x \mapsto [p, x],$$

where $\pi\colon P \to \Sigma$ denotes the bundle projection. In this way, the map $u_\alpha\colon \Sigma_\alpha \to P(M)_{z_{0\alpha}}$ is seen to be equivalent to the family of pairs

$$\big(p_\alpha, \iota_{p_\alpha}^{-1} \circ u_\alpha\colon \Sigma_\alpha \to M\big),$$

where p_α ranges over the fiber $P_{z_{0\alpha}}$.

Given a polystable vortex $(A, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z})$ of combinatorial type $T = (V = \{0\} \sqcup V_S, E, \Lambda)$, we define its **energy** to be

$$E(A, \mathbf{u}) := E(A, u_0) + \sum_{\alpha\in V_S} E(u_\alpha),$$

where $E(A, u_0)$ is the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of the vortex (A, u_0), and $E(u_\alpha)$ denotes the energy of the $J_{z_{0\alpha}}$-holomorphic curve $u_\alpha\colon \Sigma_\alpha \to P(M)_{z_{0\alpha}}$ (see [16], Section 2.2). As a special case of Definition 1.5, by an **n-marked vortex** we mean a tuple

$$(A, u, \mathbf{z}) = (A, u, z_1, \ldots, z_n)$$

consisting of a vortex (A, u) and a sequence $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ of n distinct marked points on Σ. Furthermore, for every real number $p > 2$ we denote by $\mathcal{A}^{1,p}(P)$ the space of connections on P of class $W^{1,p}$ and by $W^{1,p}_G(P, M)$ the space of G-equivariant maps $u\colon P \to M$ of class $W^{1,p}$. The group $\mathcal{G}^{2,p}(P)$ of **gauge transformations** of P of class $W^{2,p}$ acts on the space $\mathcal{A}^{1,p}(P) \times W^{1,p}_G(P, M)$ from the right by

$$g^*(A, u) := \big(g^{-1}Ag + g^{-1}\,\mathrm{d}g, g^{-1}u\big)$$

(see [22], Appendix A for details). The vortex equations (1.3) and the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy are invariant under this action.

For $z_0 \in \Sigma$ and $r > 0$, denote by

$$B_r(z_0) := \{ z \in \Sigma \,|\, |z - z_0| \le r \}$$

the closed geodesic disc in Σ of radius r centered at the point z_0, understood with respect to the metric determined by the area form dvol_Σ and the complex structure j_Σ. Let $B \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the closed unit disc.

Definition 1.7 (Gromov convergence)**.** Fix a smooth family $J\colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M, and a complex structure j_Σ and an area form dvol_Σ on Σ. Let n be a nonnegative integer, and let $T = (V = \{0\} \sqcup V_S, E, \Lambda)$ be an n-labeled tree. A sequence of n-marked vortices

$$(A_\nu, u_\nu, \mathbf{z}_\nu) = (A_\nu, u_\nu, z_1^\nu, \dots, z_n^\nu)$$

is said to **Gromov converge** to a polystable vortex of combinatorial type T

$$(A, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}) = \big((A, u_0), \{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in V_S}, \{z_{\alpha\beta}\}_{\alpha E \beta}, \{\alpha_i, z_i\}_{1 \le i \le n}\big)$$

if there exist

(a) a real number $p > 2$ and a sequence of gauge transformations $g_\nu \in \mathcal{G}^{2,p}(P)$ of the bundle P;

(b) a positive real number r such that $B_r(z_{0\alpha}) \cap Z_0 = \{z_{0\alpha}\}$ for every nodal point $z_{0\alpha} \in Z_0$;

(c) a holomorphic disc $\varphi_\alpha\colon B \to B_r(z_{0\alpha})$ such that $\varphi_\alpha(0) = z_{0\alpha}$, for each $\alpha \in V_S$;

(d) a sequence of biholomorphic maps $\phi_\alpha^\nu \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Sigma_\alpha)$, for each $\alpha \in V$, where we define $\phi_0^\nu := \mathrm{id}_{\Sigma_0}$ for all ν

such that the following holds.

(Map) The sequence

$$\Big(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu, \big\{(g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu) \circ \varphi_{z_{0\alpha}} \circ \phi_\alpha^\nu\big\}_{\alpha \in V_S}\Big)$$

converges to

$$\big(A, u_0, \{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in V_S}\big)$$

in the following sense.

(i) The sequence $(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu)$ converges to (A, u_0) strongly in the C^∞-topology on every compact subset of $\Sigma_0 \setminus Z_0$.

(ii) For every $\alpha \in V_S$ the sequence

$$u_\alpha^\nu := \big(g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu\big) \circ \varphi_{z_{0\alpha}} \circ \phi_\alpha^\nu \colon \Omega_\alpha^\nu \longrightarrow P(M),$$

where

$$\Omega_\alpha^\nu := (\phi_\alpha^\nu)^{-1} B \subset \mathbb{C}$$

is an open subset of the bubble Σ_α, converges to

$$u_\alpha \colon \Sigma_\alpha \longrightarrow P(M)_{z_{0\alpha}}$$

strongly in the C^∞-topology on every compact subset of $\Sigma_\alpha \setminus Z_\alpha$.

(Energy) The sequence $E(A_\nu, u_\nu)$ converges to $E(A, \mathbf{u})$.

(Rescaling) If $\alpha, \beta \in V_S$ are such that $\alpha E \beta$ then the sequence

$$\phi^\nu_{\alpha\beta} := (\phi^\nu_\alpha)^{-1} \circ \phi^\nu_\beta$$

converges to $z_{\alpha\beta}$ in the C^∞-topology on every compact subset of $\Sigma_\beta \setminus \{z_{\beta\alpha}\}$.

(Marked point) For each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, the sequence of marked points z_i^ν converges in the following sense:
- (i) If $\alpha_i = 0$, then the sequence z_i^ν converges to z_i in Σ_0.
- (ii) If $\alpha_i \in V_S$, then the sequence $(\varphi_{z_{0\alpha_i}} \circ \phi^\nu_{\alpha_i})^{-1}(z_i^\nu)$ converges to z_i in Σ_{α_i}.

With this definition we can now state the main result of this article.

Theorem 1.8 (Gromov compactness)**.** *Let n be a nonnegative integer. Let $(A_\nu, u_\nu, \boldsymbol{z}_\nu)$ be a sequence of n-marked vortices whose Yang-Mills-Higgs energy satisfies a uniform bound*

$$\sup_\nu E(A_\nu, u_\nu) < \infty.$$

Then the sequence $(A_\nu, u_\nu, \boldsymbol{z}_\nu)$ has a Gromov convergent subsequence.

We will prove Theorem 1.8 in Sections 4 and 5.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we establish an a priori estimate for vortices, which plays a central role in all subsequent arguments. This estimate is used in Section 3 to prove the Removable Singularity Theorem 1.1. The proof of the Gromov Compactness Theorem 1.8 is divided into two parts. In Section 4 we prove compactness for vortices on the principal component, ignoring any bubbling in the fibers. Section 5 is then concerned with the actual construction of the Gromov compactification, beginning with two preparatory subsections. In Section 5.1 we explain how vortices may naturally be considered as pseudoholomorphic curves, and in Section 5.2 we adapt the bubbling analysis from McDuff and Salamon [16] to our situation. We close with the actual proof of Gromov compactness in Section 5.3 by combining results from the earlier sections.

Acknowledgments: I am very grateful to my supervisors Dietmar Salamon and Christopher Woodward for their encouragement and support, and for all their help in writing this article. I am also indebted to Fabian Ziltener for many helpful discussions, and I would further like to thank Eduardo González, Tobias Hartnick, and Jan Swoboda for their valuable comments. Finally I would like to thank the Mathematics Department at Rutgers University for their hospitality and excellent working conditions.

2. A priori estimate

The goal of this section is to prove an a priori estimate for symplectic vortices. Special cases of this estimate were proved before by Gaio and Salamon [4], Frauenfelder [3], and Ziltener [27]. In fact we will prove two versions of this estimate, a local version for vortices on the punctured unit disc, and a global version for vortices on the Riemann surface Σ. Let us consider the local case first.

Recall from the previous section that we denote by $B \subset \mathbb{C}$ the closed unit disc, with complex coordinate $z = s + \mathrm{i}t$. Fix a smooth family $J\colon B \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M and a smooth function $\lambda\colon B \to (0, \infty)$. Let $z_0 \in B$ and $r > 0$ be such that the closed disc

$$B_r(z_0) := \bigl\{ z \in \mathbb{C} \bigm| |z - z_0| \le r \bigr\}$$

is contained in B. Extending the terminology introduced in Section 1, a triple (Φ, Ψ, u) consisting of smooth functions $\Phi, \Psi\colon B_r(z_0) \to \mathfrak{g}$ and a smooth map $u\colon B_r(z_0) \to M$ is called a **vortex on the disc** $B_r(z_0)$ if it is a solution of the vortex equations

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s u + X_\Phi(u) + J\bigl(\partial_t u + X_\Psi(u)\bigr) &= 0 \\ \partial_s \Psi - \partial_t \Phi + [\Phi, \Psi] + \lambda^2\, \mu(u) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

The Yang-Mills-Higgs energy density of the vortex (Φ, Ψ, u) is the function

$$e(\Phi, \Psi, u) := \bigl|\partial_s u + X_\Phi(u)\bigr|_J^2 + \lambda^2 \bigl|\mu(u)\bigr|_{\mathfrak{g}}^2,$$

and its Yang-Mills-Higgs energy is defined by

$$E\bigl(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\bigr) := \int_{B_r(z_0)} e(\Phi, \Psi, u)\; \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t.$$

The vortex (Φ, Ψ, u) satisfies the following basic a priori estimate.

Theorem 2.1 (A priori estimate, local version)**.** *Fix a smooth family $J\colon B \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M and a smooth function $\lambda\colon B \to (0, \infty)$. Then there exist constants $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for all $z_0 \in B$ and all $r > 0$ such that $B_r(z_0) \subset B$ the following holds. If (Φ, Ψ, u) is a vortex on the disc $B_r(z_0)$, then*

$$E\bigl(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\bigr) < \delta \quad \Longrightarrow \quad e(\Phi, \Psi, u)(z_0) \le \frac{C}{r^2} \cdot E\bigl(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\bigr).$$

This a priori estimate is the main analytical tool of this article. As a consequence, we obtain the following a priori estimate for vortices on Σ. Fix a smooth family $J\colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M, and a complex structure j_Σ and an area form dvol_Σ on Σ. For $z_0 \in \Sigma$ and $r > 0$, denote by

$$B_r(z_0) := \bigl\{ z \in \Sigma \bigm| |z - z_0| \le r \bigr\}$$

the closed geodesic disc in Σ of radius r centered at the point z_0, understood with respect to the metric determined by the area form dvol_Σ and the complex structure j_Σ. Recall from the previous section that a pair $(A,u) \in \mathcal{A}(P) \times C^\infty_G(P,M)$ is called a vortex if it is a solution of the vortex equations

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A}(u) = 0, \qquad F_A + \mu(u)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = 0, \tag{2.2}$$

and that its Yang-Mills-Higgs energy is given by

$$E\big(A,u;B_r(z_0)\big) = \int_{B_r(z_0)} \left(\frac{1}{2}\left|\mathrm{d}_A u\right|_J^2 + \left|\mu(u)\right|_{\mathfrak{g}}^2\right) \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\,.$$

The vortex (A,u) satisfies the following a priori estimate.

Corollary 2.2 (A priori estimate, global version)**.** *Fix a smooth family $J\colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M,\omega)$ of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M, and a complex structure j_Σ and an area form* dvol_Σ *on Σ. Then there exist constants $\hbar > 0$, $C > 0$ and $R > 0$ such that for all $z_0 \in \Sigma$ and all $0 < r \le R$ the following holds. If (A,u) is a vortex on Σ, then*

$$E\big(A,u;B_r(z_0)\big) < \hbar \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \frac{1}{2}\big|\mathrm{d}_A u(z_0)\big|_J^2 + \big|\mu(u(z_0))\big|_{\mathfrak{g}}^2 \le \frac{C}{r^2} \cdot E\big(A,u;B_r(z_0)\big).$$

We now prove Theorem 2.1. The proof is based on the following two propositions.

Proposition 2.3. *Fix a smooth family $J\colon B \to \mathcal{J}_G(M,\omega)$ of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M and a smooth function $\lambda\colon B \to (0,\infty)$. Then there exists a constant $c \ge 0$ such that for all $z_0 \in B$ and all $0 < r \le 1$ such that $B_r(z_0) \subset B$ the following holds.*

If (Φ,Ψ,ϕ) is a vortex on the disc $B_r(z_0)$, then its Yang-Mills-Higgs energy density $e := e(\Phi,\Psi,\phi)$ satisfies the partial differential inequality

$$\Delta e \ge -c\big(e + e^2\big)$$

on $B_r(z_0)$.

Proposition 2.4 (Wehrheim [23])**.** *There exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that the following holds for all $0 < r \le 1$. Let $w\colon B_r(0) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function of class C^2 and assume that it satisfies for some constant $c \ge 0$ the inequalities*

$$\Delta w \ge -c\left(w + w^2\right), \qquad w \ge 0, \qquad \int_{B_r(0)} w < \frac{c_1}{c}.$$

Then

$$w(0) \le c_2\left(c + \frac{1}{r^2}\right)\int_{B_r(0)} w.$$

The proof of Proposition 2.3 is deferred to the end of this section. Proposition 2.4 is a special case of the mean value inequality of Theorem 1.1 in Wehrheim [23].

Proof of Theorem 2.1: We prove Theorem 2.1 assuming Proposition 2.3. Let c be the constant from Proposition 2.3, and let c_1, c_2 be the constants from Proposition 2.4. Define constants

$$\delta := \frac{c_1}{c} \quad \text{and} \quad C := c_2(c+1). \tag{2.3}$$

Let $z_0 \in B$ and $r > 0$ be such that the disc $B_r(z_0)$ is contained in B. Assume that (Φ, Ψ, u) is a vortex on $B_r(z_0)$. Denote by $e := e(\Phi, \Psi, u)$ its Yang-Mills-Higgs energy density, and define a function $w\colon B_r(0) \to \mathbb{R}$ by translation

$$w(z) := e(z - z_0)$$

for all $z \in B_r(z_0)$. Then Proposition 2.3 implies that

$$\Delta w \geq -c\left(w + w^2\right), \qquad w \geq 0.$$

Hence it follows from Proposition 2.4 that

$$\int_{B_r(0)} w < \frac{c_1}{c} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad w(0) \leq c_2\left(c + \frac{1}{r^2}\right)\int_{B_r(0)} w. \tag{2.4}$$

Since

$$E\big(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\big) = \int_{B_r(z_0)} e = \int_{B_r(0)} w$$

and $r \leq 1$ by assumption, we conclude from (2.4) and (2.3) that

$$E\big(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\big) < \delta \quad \Longrightarrow \quad e(\Phi, \Psi, u)(z_0) \leq \frac{C}{r^2} \cdot E\big(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\big).$$

This proves Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Corollary 2.2: We deduce Corollary 2.2 from Theorem 2.1. Let $B \subset \mathbb{C}$ denote the closed unit disc in $\mathbb{C}$. Choose a finite collection of closed holomorphic discs in Σ given by biholomorphic maps

$$\varphi_j\colon \mathbb{C} \supset B \longrightarrow \Sigma, \qquad j = 1, \ldots, N,$$

in such a way that the collection of open subsets

$$U_j := \varphi_j(B \setminus \partial B), \qquad j = 1, \ldots, N,$$

forms an open covering of Σ. By the Lebesgue Number Lemma, there exists a constant $R > 0$ such that the following holds. For every $z_0 \in \Sigma$ and every $0 < r < R$ there exists $j_0 \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ such that the closed geodesic disc $B_r(z_0)$ is contained in U_{j_0}. For $j = 1, \ldots, N$, we obtain a smooth family

$$J \circ \varphi_j\colon B \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$$

of G-invariant almost complex structures on M. Moreover, the area form dvol_Σ defines a smooth function $\lambda_j\colon B \to (0, \infty)$ by the relation

$$\varphi_j^* \,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = \lambda_j^2 \,\mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t.$$

Denote by $\mathrm{d}_\Sigma\colon \Sigma\times\Sigma\to[0,\infty)$ the distance function on Σ induced by the metric determined by the area form dvol_Σ and the complex structure j_Σ, and by $\mathrm{d}_B\colon B\times B\to[0,\infty)$ the distance function on B determined by the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{C}$. Since B is compact and $\varphi_j\colon B\to\Sigma_0$ is holomorphic, there exists a constant $c_j>0$ such that

$$\mathrm{d}_\Sigma\big(\varphi_j(\zeta_1),\varphi_j(\zeta_2)\big)\le c_j\cdot \mathrm{d}_B(\zeta_1,\zeta_2) \tag{2.5}$$

for all $\zeta_1,\zeta_2\in B$. Furthermore, by Theorem 2.1 there exist constants $\delta_j>0$ and $C_j>0$, depending on the family $J\circ\varphi_j$ and the function λ_j, such that for all $\zeta_0\in B$ and all $r>0$ such that $B_r(\zeta_0)\subset B$ the following holds. If (Φ,Ψ,u) is a vortex solving the equations

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_s u+X_\Phi(u)+(J\circ\varphi_j)\big(\partial_t u+X_\Psi(u)\big)&=0\\ \partial_s\Psi-\partial_t\Phi+[\Phi,\Psi]+\lambda_j^2\,\mu(u)&=0\end{aligned}$$

on B, then

$$E\big(\Phi,\Psi,u;B_r(\zeta_0)\big)<\delta_j\quad\Longrightarrow\quad e(\Phi,\Psi,u)(\zeta_0)\le\frac{C_j}{r^2}\cdot E\big(\Phi,\Psi,u;B_r(\zeta_0)\big). \tag{2.6}$$

With all this understood, we define constants

$$\hbar:=\min_{1\le j\le N}\big\{\delta_j\big\}\quad\text{and}\quad C:=\max_{1\le j\le N}\big\{C_j\cdot c_j^2\cdot\|\lambda_j\|_{C^0(B)}^{-2}\big\}. \tag{2.7}$$

Let now (A,u) be a vortex on Σ solving equations (2.2). Let $z_0\in\Sigma$ and $0<r<R$, and assume that

$$E\big(A,u;B_r(z_0)\big)<\hbar. \tag{2.8}$$

As we have seen above, there exists $j_0\in\{1,\dots,N\}$ such that the closed geodesic disc $B_r(z_0)$ is contained in the open set U_{j_0}. As pointed out in Remark 1.3, locally in the chart $\varphi_{j_0}\colon B\to\Sigma$ the vortex (A,u) is given by a triple $(\Phi,\Psi,u^{\mathrm{loc}})$ that solves the vortex equations

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_s u^{\mathrm{loc}}+X_\Phi\big(u^{\mathrm{loc}}\big)+(J\circ\varphi_{j_0})\big(\partial_t u^{\mathrm{loc}}+X_\Psi\big(u^{\mathrm{loc}}\big)\big)&=0\\ \partial_s\Psi-\partial_t\Phi+[\Phi,\Psi]+\lambda_{j_0}^2\,\mu\big(u^{\mathrm{loc}}\big)&=0\end{aligned}$$

on the disc B. Define

$$\zeta_0:=\varphi_{j_0}^{-1}(z_0)\quad\text{and}\quad\rho_0:=c_{j_0}^{-1}\cdot r, \tag{2.9}$$

where the constant c_{j_0} was defined by (2.5). We consider the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of the vortex (Φ,Ψ,u) on the disc $B_{\rho_0}(\zeta_0)$. It follows from Estimate (2.5) that

$$B_{\rho_0}(\zeta_0)\subset\varphi_{j_0}^{-1}\big(B_r(z_0)\big)\subset B.$$

Using Formula (1.5), we obtain from this an estimate

$$E\big(\Phi,\Psi,u^{\mathrm{loc}};B_{\rho_0}(\zeta_0)\big)\le E\big(\Phi,\Psi,u^{\mathrm{loc}};\varphi_{j_0}^{-1}(B_r(z_0)\big)=E\big(A,u;B_r(z_0)\big). \tag{2.10}$$

By assumption (2.8) and the definition of the constant $\hbar$ in (2.7) it follows that

$$E\big(\Phi,\Psi,u^{\mathrm{loc}};B_{\rho_0}(\zeta_0)\big)<\hbar\le\delta_{j_0}.$$

Hence the a priori estimate (2.6) applies to the vortex $(\Phi, \Psi, u^{\mathrm{loc}})$, yielding an estimate

$$e\big(\Phi, \Psi, u^{\mathrm{loc}}\big)(\zeta_0) \leq \frac{C_{j_0}}{\rho_0^2} \cdot E\big(\Phi, \Psi, u^{\mathrm{loc}}; B_{\rho_0}(\zeta_0)\big).$$

Using Inequality (2.10) and the definition of ρ_0 in (2.9), we obtain from this

$$e\big(\Phi, \Psi, u^{\mathrm{loc}}\big)(\zeta_0) \leq \frac{C_{j_0} \cdot c_{j_0}^2}{r^2} \cdot E\big(A, u; B_r(z_0)\big).$$

The claimed a priori inequality will now follow from the identity

$$\frac{1}{2} \left|\mathrm{d}_A u(z_0)\right|^2 + \left|\mu(u(z_0))\right|^2 = e\big(\Phi, \Psi, u^{\mathrm{loc}}\big)(\zeta_0) \cdot \lambda_{j_0}^{-2}(\zeta_0),$$

which holds by Formula (1.4). By definition of the constant C in (2.7) we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2} \left|\mathrm{d}_A u(z_0)\right|^2 + \left|\mu(u(z_0))\right|^2 &\leq \frac{C_{j_0} \cdot c_{j_0}^2 \|\lambda_{j_0}\|_{C^0(B)}^{-2}}{r^2} \cdot E\big(A, u; B_r(z_0)\big) \\ &= \frac{C}{r^2} \cdot E\big(A, u; B_r(z_0)\big).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Corollary 2.2.

Proof of Proposition 2.3: The proof will be in two stages. We first compute an explicit formula for Δe (Claim 1), and then obtain the claimed inequality

$$\Delta e \geq -c\big(e + e^2\big)$$

using a straightforward estimate (Claim 2). Assume that (Φ, Ψ, u) is a vortex on the disc $D := B_r(z_0)$ and write $e := e(\Phi, \Psi, u)$ for its Yang-Mills-Higgs energy density (1.2). Before we may begin with the computations we need to introduce some notation. Set

$$v_s := \partial_s u + X_\Phi(u), \qquad v_t := \partial_t u + X_\Psi(u)$$

and

$$\kappa := \partial_s \Psi - \partial_t \Phi + [\Phi, \Psi].$$

Note that v_s and v_t are smooth sections of the vector bundle $u^*TM \to D$ and that κ is a smooth function $D \to \mathfrak{g}$. With this notation, the vortex equations take the form

$$v_s + J(u)\, v_t = 0, \qquad \kappa + \lambda^2 \mu(u) = 0, \tag{2.11}$$

and the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy density of the vortex (Φ, Ψ, u) is given by

$$e = e(\Phi, \Psi, u) = |v_s|^2 + \lambda^2 \, |\mu(u)|^2 .$$

Before we start with the computation, we recall from Appendix A the definition of certain operators. First of all, the family $J\colon D \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ gives rise to a family

$$\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_J \colon D \ni z \mapsto \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{J_z}$$

of Riemannian metrics on M which in turn determines a family

$$\nabla \colon D \ni z \mapsto \nabla_{J_z}$$

of associated Levi-Civita connections on M and a family of corresponding Riemann curvature tensors

$$R\colon D \ni z \mapsto R_z \in \Omega^2(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)).$$

We will also denote the infinitesimal action of G on M at a point $x \in M$ by

$$\mathrm{L}_x\colon \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow T_xM, \qquad \xi \mapsto \mathrm{L}_x\xi = X_\xi(x),$$

and its adjoint with respect to the inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ and the family of metrics $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_J$ on M by

$$\mathrm{L}_x^*\colon T_xM \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}, \qquad v \mapsto \mathrm{L}_x^* v.$$

Let us further denote by

$$A := \Phi\,\mathrm{d}s + \Psi\,\mathrm{d}t \in \Omega^1(D, \mathfrak{g})$$

the smooth connection 1-form on the disc D determined by Φ and Ψ. We then have a twisted covariant derivative

$$\nabla_A\colon \Omega^0(D, \mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow \Omega^1(D, \mathfrak{g}), \qquad \nabla_A\eta = \mathrm{d}\eta + [A, \eta],$$

acting on smooth $\mathfrak{g}$-valued functions on D. Evaluating in the directions of the coordinate vector fields ∂_s and ∂_t, we obtain operators

$$\nabla_{A,s}, \nabla_{A,t}\colon \Omega^0(D, \mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow \Omega^0(D, \mathfrak{g})$$

given by the formulas

$$\nabla_{A,s}\eta = \partial_s\eta + [\Phi, \eta], \qquad \nabla_{A,t}\eta = \partial_t\eta + [\Psi, \eta].$$

In addition, we have a twisted covariant derivative

$$\nabla_A\colon \Omega^0(D, u^*TM) \longrightarrow \Omega^1(D, u^*TM), \qquad \nabla_A\xi = \nabla\xi + \nabla_\xi X_A(u),$$

acting on sections of the vector bundle $u^*TM \to D$. Evaluating in the directions of the coordinate vector fields ∂_s and ∂_t, we obtain operators

$$\nabla_{A,s}, \nabla_{A,t}\colon \Omega^0(D, u^*TM) \longrightarrow \Omega^0(D, u^*TM)$$

given by the formulas

$$\nabla_{A,s}\xi = \nabla_s\xi + \nabla_\xi X_\Phi(u), \qquad \nabla_{A,t}\xi = \nabla_t\xi + \nabla_\xi X_\Psi(u).$$

Moreover, we have a twisted covariant derivative

$$\delta_A\colon \Omega^0\big(D, \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM))\big) \longrightarrow \Omega^1\big(D, \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM))\big)$$

acting on functions $D \to \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM))$ given by

$$\delta_A I = \mathrm{d}I - \mathcal{L}_{X_A} I,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{X_A} I$ is the Lie derivative of I along the vector field X_A. Evaluating in the directions of the coordinate vector fields ∂_s and ∂_t, we obtain operators

$$\delta_{A,s}, \delta_{A,t}\colon \Omega^0\big(D, \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)\big) \longrightarrow \Omega^0\big(D, \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)\big),$$

given by

$$\delta_{A,s} I = \partial_s I - \mathcal{L}_{X_\Phi} I, \qquad \delta_{A,t} L = \partial_t I - \mathcal{L}_{X_\Psi} I.$$

Lastly, recall that the twisted derivative of the family $\nabla\colon D \ni z \mapsto \nabla_{J_z}$ of connections on M is given by the map

$$\mathrm{D}_A\nabla = \mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}} \circ \delta_A J \colon TD \longrightarrow \Omega^1(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)),$$

where $\mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}}$ is the derivative of the map $\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}}\colon \mathcal{J}(M,\omega) \ni I \mapsto \nabla_I$, which assigns to every ω-compatible almost complex structure I on M the Levi-Civita connection determined by the corresponding Riemannian metric $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_I = \omega(\cdot, I\cdot)$. Evaluating in the directions of the coordinate vector fields ∂_s and ∂_t, we obtain functions

$$\mathrm{D}_{A,s}\nabla, \mathrm{D}_{A,t}\nabla \colon D \longrightarrow \Omega^1(M, \mathrm{End}(TM))$$

given by

$$\mathrm{D}_{A,s}\nabla = \mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}}\big(\delta_{A,s}J\big), \qquad \mathrm{D}_{A,t}\nabla = \mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}}\big(\delta_{A,t}J\big).$$

To close this review of notation, we recall from Appendix A that there is a $\mathfrak{g}$-valued bilinear form $\rho\colon u^*TM \otimes u^*TM \to \mathfrak{g}$ satisfying

$$\langle \eta, \rho(\xi_1,\xi_2)\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} = \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} X_\eta(u), \xi_2\rangle_J$$

for $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \Omega^0(D, u^*TM)$ and $\eta \in \Omega^0(D, \mathfrak{g})$.

We are now ready to prove Proposition 2.3. We will begin by deriving the following identity.

Claim 1. *The Laplacian of the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy density is given by the formula*

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta e = {}& 2\,|\nabla_{A,s}v_s|^2 + 2\,|\nabla_{A,t}v_s|^2 - 2\,|(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s|^2 - 2\,\langle v_s, R(v_s,v_t)v_t\rangle \\ & - 2\,\langle v_s, (\mathrm{D}_{A,s}\nabla)(v_t)\,v_t\rangle + 2\,\langle v_s, (\mathrm{D}_{A,t}\nabla)(v_s)\,v_t\rangle - 6\,\partial_s(\lambda^2)\langle\mu(u), \mathrm{L}_u^* v_t\rangle \\ & + 6\,\partial_t(\lambda^2)\langle\mu(u), \mathrm{L}_u^* v_s\rangle - 2\lambda^2\langle(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s, \mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle + 2\lambda^2\langle\mu(u), 3\rho(v_t,v_s) \\ & - 2\rho(v_s,v_t)\rangle + 4\lambda^2|\mathrm{L}_u^* v_t|^2 + 4\lambda^2|\mathrm{L}_u^* v_s|^2 + \Delta(\lambda^2)|\mu(u)|^2 + 2\lambda^4|\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)|^2 \\ & - 2\lambda^2\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_t, \mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle + 2\,\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_t, \nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + 2\,\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s, \nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle \\ & + 4\,\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_t, \nabla_{A,t}v_s\rangle - 2\,\langle v_s, (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t\rangle + 2\,\langle v_s, (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle \\ & + \langle v_t, (\nabla_{v_t}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle + \langle v_t, (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle - \langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s, (\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s\rangle \\ & + \langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s, (\nabla_{v_t}J)v_s\rangle - 2\,\langle v_s, (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t\rangle + 2\,\langle v_s, (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle \\ & + \langle v_t, (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle + \langle v_t, (\delta_{A,t}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle. \qquad (2.12)\end{aligned}$$

Our proof builds on the computations carried out by Gaio and Salamon [4], Section 9. Recall that

$$e = |v_s|^2 + \lambda^2\,|\mu(u)|^2,$$

and therefore

$$\Delta e = \Delta\big(|v_s|^2\big) + \Delta\big(\lambda^2\,|\mu(u)|^2\big). \qquad (2.13)$$

We will compute each term separately. Let us first consider

$$\Delta\big(|v_s|^2\big) = \partial_s^2\big(|v_s|^2\big) + \partial_t^2\big(|v_s|^2\big).$$

By Proposition A.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_s\big(|v_s|^2\big) &= \partial_s\langle v_s, v_s\rangle\\ &= \langle \nabla_{A,s}v_s, v_s\rangle + \langle v_s, \nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + \langle Jv_s, (\delta_{A,s}J)v_s\rangle\\ &= 2\,\langle v_s, \nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + \langle Jv_s, (\delta_{A,s}J)v_s\rangle\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_s^2(|v_s|^2) \;&=\; 2\;\partial_s\langle v_s, \nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + \partial_s\langle Jv_s, (\delta_{A,s}J)v_s\rangle\\ &=\; 2\,\langle v_s, \nabla_{A,s}\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + 2\,\langle \nabla_{A,s}v_s, \nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + 2\,\langle Jv_s, (\delta_{A,s}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle\\ &\quad\; + \langle \nabla_{A,s}(Jv_s), (\delta_{A,s}J)v_s\rangle + \langle Jv_s, \nabla_{A,s}((\delta_{A,s}J)v_s)\rangle\\ &\quad\; + \langle (\delta_{A,s}J)Jv_s, J(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s)\rangle\\ &=\; 2\,\langle v_s, \nabla_{A,s}\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + 2\;|\nabla_{A,s}v_s|^2 + 2\,\langle Jv_s, (\delta_{A,s}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle\\ &\quad\; + \langle (\delta_{A,s}J)v_s, \nabla_{A,s}(Jv_s)\rangle + \langle Jv_s, \nabla_{A,s}((\delta_{A,s}J)v_s)\rangle - |J(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s|^2\,,\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds by Lemma A.4 (i). By Proposition A.5,

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla_{A,s}(Jv_s) = J\nabla_{A,s}v_s + (\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s + (\delta_{A,s}J)v_s,\\ &\nabla_{A,s}((\delta_{A,s}J)v_s) = (\delta_{A,s}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s + (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s + (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s.\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into the previous expression, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_s^2\big(|v_s|^2\big) &= 2\,\langle v_s, \nabla_{A,s}\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + 2\;|\nabla_{A,s}v_s|^2 + 2\,\langle Jv_s, (\delta_{A,s}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle\\ &\quad + \langle (\delta_{A,s}J)v_s, J\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + \langle (\delta_{A,s}J)v_s, (\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s\rangle + \langle (\delta_{A,s}J)v_s, (\delta_{A,s}J)v_s\rangle\\ &\quad + \langle Jv_s, (\delta_{A,s}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + \langle Jv_s, (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle + \langle Jv_s, (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle\\ &\quad - |J(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s|^2\,.\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma A.4 (i), (iii) this becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_s^2\big(|v_s|^2\big) &= 2\,\langle v_s, \nabla_{A,s}\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + 2\;|\nabla_{A,s}v_s|^2 + 2\,\langle (\delta_{A,s}J)Jv_s, \nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle\\ &\quad + \langle (\delta_{A,s}J)Jv_s, \nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + \langle (\delta_{A,s}J)v_s, (\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s\rangle + |(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s|^2\\ &\quad + \langle (\delta_{A,s}J)Jv_s, \nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + \langle Jv_s, (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle + \langle Jv_s, (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle\\ &\quad - |(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s|^2\\ &= 2\;|\nabla_{A,s}v_s|^2 + 2\,\langle v_s, \nabla_{A,s}\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + 4\,\langle (\delta_{A,s}J)Jv_s, \nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle\\ &\quad + \langle (\delta_{A,s}J)v_s, (\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s\rangle + \langle Jv_s, (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle + \langle Jv_s, (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Likewise, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t^2\big(|v_s|^2\big) &= 2\;|\nabla_{A,t}v_s|^2 + 2\,\langle v_s, \nabla_{A,t}\nabla_{A,t}v_s\rangle + 4\,\langle (\delta_{A,t}J)Jv_s, \nabla_{A,t}v_s\rangle\\ &\quad + \langle (\delta_{A,t}J)v_s, (\nabla_{v_t}J)v_s\rangle + \langle Jv_s, (\nabla_{v_t}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle + \langle Jv_s, (\delta_{A,t}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two formulas and using the first vortex equation (2.11) we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\big(|v_s|^2\big) &= 2\,|\nabla_{A,s}v_s|^2 + 2\,|\nabla_{A,t}v_s|^2 + 2\,\langle v_s, (\nabla_{A,s}\nabla_{A,s} + \nabla_{A,t}\nabla_{A,t})v_s\rangle \\ &\quad + 4\,\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_t, \nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + 4\,\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_t, \nabla_{A,t}v_s\rangle + \langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s, (\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s\rangle \\ &\quad + \langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s, (\nabla_{v_t}J)v_s\rangle + \langle v_t, (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle + \langle v_t, (\nabla_{v_t}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle \\ &\quad + \langle v_t, (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle + \langle v_t, (\delta_{A,t}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle. \qquad (2.14)\end{aligned}$$

We can compute this further using the following two lemmata.

Lemma 2.5. *The sections v_s, v_t and the function κ satisfy the following identities.*

(i) $\nabla_{A,s}v_t - \nabla_{A,t}v_s = \mathrm{L}_u\kappa$

(ii) $\nabla_{A,s}v_s + \nabla_{A,t}v_t = -J\,\mathrm{L}_u\kappa - (\delta_{A,s}J)v_t + (\delta_{A,t}J)v_s$

Proof. Using the formulas

$$\nabla_s X_\Psi(u) = X_{\partial_s\Psi}(u) + \nabla_{\partial_s u}X_\Psi(u), \qquad \nabla_t X_\Phi(u) = X_{\partial_t\Phi}(u) + \nabla_{\partial_t u}X_\Phi(u)$$

and rearranging terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla_{A,s}v_t - \nabla_{A,t}v_s \\ &= \nabla_s\,\partial_t u + \nabla_s X_\Psi(u) + \nabla_{\partial_t u}X_\Phi(u) + \nabla_{X_\Psi(u)}X_\Phi(u) - \nabla_t\,\partial_s u - \nabla_t X_\Phi(u) \\ &\qquad - \nabla_{\partial_s u}X_\Psi(u) - \nabla_{X_\Phi(u)}X_\Psi(u) \\ &= \nabla_s\,\partial_t u - \nabla_t\,\partial_s u + X_{\partial_s\Phi}(u) - X_{\partial_t\Phi}(u) + \nabla_{X_\Psi(u)}X_\Phi(u) - \nabla_{X_\Phi(u)}X_\Psi(u) + \nabla_{\partial_s u}X_\Psi(u) \\ &\qquad - \nabla_{\partial_s u}X_\Psi(u) - \nabla_{\partial_t u}X_\Phi(u) + \nabla_{\partial_t u}X_\Phi(u) \\ &= \nabla_{\partial_s u}\,\partial_t u - \nabla_{\partial_t u}\,\partial_s u + X_{\partial_s\Phi}(u) - X_{\partial_t\Phi}(u) + \nabla_{X_\Psi(u)}X_\Phi(u) - \nabla_{X_\Phi(u)}X_\Psi(u).\end{aligned}$$

Since the Levi-Civita connection ∇_z is torsion free for $z \in D$,

$$\nabla_{\partial_s u}\,\partial_t u - \nabla_{\partial_t u}\,\partial_s u = [\partial_t u, \partial_s u] = 0$$

and

$$\nabla_{X_\Psi(u)}X_\Phi(u) - \nabla_{X_\Phi(u)}X_\Psi(u) = [X_\Phi(u), X_\Psi(u)] = X_{[\Phi,\Psi]}(u).$$

Note that, to be consistent with [4], we use the sign convention for the Lie bracket defined in [15], Remark 3.3. That is, for vector fields X, Y on M we have $L_{[X,Y]} = [L_Y, L_X]$. Whence

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{A,s}v_t - \nabla_{A,t}v_s &= X_{\partial_s\Psi}(u) - X_{\partial_t\Phi}(u) + X_{[\Phi,\Psi]}(u) \\ &= \mathrm{L}_u\big(\,\partial_s\Psi - \partial_t\Phi + [\Phi,\Psi]\big) \\ &= \mathrm{L}_u\kappa.\end{aligned}$$

For the proof of (ii) we will need the following formula:

$$(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_t - (\nabla_{v_t}J)v_s = 0. \qquad (2.15)$$

To see this, just note that by the first vortex equation (2.11),

$$(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_t = -(\nabla_{Jv_t}J)(Jv_s) = J^2(\nabla_{Jv_t}J)(Jv_s),$$

and using Lemma A.1 (ii), (i), we therefore get

$$(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_t = J(\nabla_{v_t}J)(Jv_s) = -J^2(\nabla_{v_t}J)v_s = (\nabla_{v_t}J)v_s.$$

Now by the first vortex equation (2.11) and Proposition A.5,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla_{A,s}v_s + \nabla_{A,t}v_t\\
&= -\nabla_{A,s}(Jv_t) + \nabla_{A,t}(Jv_s)\\
&= -J\nabla_{A,s}v_t - (\nabla_{v_s}J)v_t - (\delta_{A,s}J)v_t + J\nabla_{A,t}v_s + (\nabla_{v_t}J)v_s + (\delta_{A,t}J)v_s\\
&= -J(\nabla_{A,s}v_t - \nabla_{A,t}v_s) - (\nabla_{v_s}J)v_t + (\nabla_{v_t}J)v_s - (\delta_{A,s}J)v_t + (\delta_{A,t}J)v_s.
\end{aligned}$$

By Assertion (i) and Formula (2.15) we thus obtain

$$\nabla_{A,s}v_s + \nabla_{A,t}v_t = -J\,\mathrm{L}_u\kappa - (\delta_{A,s}J)v_t + (\delta_{A,t}J)v_s.$$

□

Lemma 2.6. *The twisted Laplacian of the section v_s is given by the formula*

$$\begin{aligned}
(\nabla_{A,s}\nabla_{A,s} + \nabla_{A,t}\nabla_{A,t})v_s &= -R(v_s,v_t)v_t - (\mathrm{D}_{A,s}\nabla)(v_t)\,v_t + (\mathrm{D}_{A,t}\nabla)(v_s)\,v_t\\
&+ \partial_s(\lambda^2)J\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) + \partial_t(\lambda^2)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) + \lambda^2(\nabla_{v_s}J)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) + \lambda^2(\delta_{A,s}J)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\\
&+ \lambda^2 J\nabla_{v_s}X_{\mu(u)}(u) + 2\lambda^2\nabla_{v_t}X_{\mu(u)}(u) - \lambda^2 J\,\mathrm{L}_u\mathrm{L}_u^*Jv_s + \lambda^2\,\mathrm{L}_u\mathrm{L}_u^*v_s\\
&+ J(\delta_{A,s}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s + (\delta_{A,t}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s - (\delta_{A,s}J)(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s - (\delta_{A,s}J)(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s\\
&- (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t + (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s - (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t + (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma A.10, the second vortex equation (2.11) and Lemma 2.5 (ii), (i),

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\nabla_{A,s}\nabla_{A,s} + \nabla_{A,t}\nabla_{A,t})v_s\\
&= (\nabla_{A,t}\nabla_{A,s} - \nabla_{A,s}\nabla_{A,t})v_t + \nabla_{A,s}(\nabla_{A,s}v_s + \nabla_{A,t}v_t) - \nabla_{A,t}(\nabla_{A,s}v_t - \nabla_{A,t}v_s)\\
&= -R(v_s,v_t)v_t + \lambda^2\,\nabla_{v_t}X_{\mu(u)}(u) - \big((\mathrm{D}_{A,s}\nabla)(v_t) - (\mathrm{D}_{A,t}\nabla)(v_s)\big)v_t - \nabla_{A,s}(J\,\mathrm{L}_u\kappa)\\
&\qquad - \nabla_{A,s}((\delta_{A,s}J)Jv_s) + \nabla_{A,s}((\delta_{A,t}J)v_s) - \nabla_{A,t}(\mathrm{L}_u\kappa). \qquad (2.16)
\end{aligned}$$

We will inspect the last four terms on the right-hand side of this equality separately. By the second vortex equation (2.11) and Proposition A.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla_{A,s}(J\,\mathrm{L}_u\kappa)\\
&= -\nabla_{A,s}(\lambda^2 J\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u))\\
&= -\,\partial_s(\lambda^2)J\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) - \lambda^2\,\nabla_{A,s}(J\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u))\\
&= -\,\partial_s(\lambda^2)J\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) - \lambda^2 J\nabla_{A,s}\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) - \lambda^2(\nabla_{v_s}J)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) - \lambda^2(\delta_{A,s}J)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Lemmas A.9 and A.3,

$$\nabla_{A,s}(\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)) = \mathrm{L}_u(\nabla_{A,s}\mu(u)) + \nabla_{v_s}X_{\mu(u)}(u) = -\,\mathrm{L}_u\mathrm{L}_u^*Jv_s + \nabla_{v_s}X_{\mu(u)}(u).$$

Whence

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{A,s}(J\,\mathrm{L}_u\kappa) = &-\partial_s(\lambda^2)J\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) - \lambda^2(\nabla_{v_s}J)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) + \lambda^2 J\,\mathrm{L}_u\mathrm{L}_u^*Jv_s \\ &- \lambda^2 J\nabla_{v_s}X_{\mu(u)}(u) - \lambda^2(\delta_{A,s}J)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u). \qquad (2.17)\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using the vortex equations (2.11) and Lemmas A.9 and A.3, we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{A,t}(\mathrm{L}_u\kappa) &= -\nabla_{A,t}(\lambda^2\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)) \\ &= -\partial_t(\lambda^2)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) - \lambda^2\,\nabla_{A,t}(\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)) \\ &= -\partial_t(\lambda^2)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) - \lambda^2\,\mathrm{L}_u\nabla_{A,t}\mu(u) - \lambda^2\,\nabla_{v_t}X_{\mu(u)}(u) \\ &= -\partial_t(\lambda^2)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) + \lambda^2\,\mathrm{L}_u\mathrm{L}_u^*Jv_t - \lambda^2\,\nabla_{v_t}X_{\mu(u)}(u) \\ &= -\partial_t(\lambda^2)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) - \lambda^2\,\mathrm{L}_u\mathrm{L}_u^*\,v_s - \lambda^2\,\nabla_{v_t}X_{\mu(u)}(u). \qquad (2.18)\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by Proposition A.5 we have

$$\nabla_{A,s}((\delta_{A,t}J)v_s) = (\delta_{A,t}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s + (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s + (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s \qquad (2.19)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{A,s}((\delta_{A,s}J)Jv_s) &= (\delta_{A,s}J)\nabla_{A,s}(Jv_s) + (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))Jv_s + (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))Jv_s \\ &= -J(\delta_{A,s}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s + (\delta_{A,s}J)(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s + (\delta_{A,s}J)(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s \\ &\quad + (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t + (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t, \qquad (2.20)\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used Lemma A.4 (i) and the first vortex equation (2.11). Plugging (2.17), (2.18), (2.19) and (2.20) into Formula (2.16) above, we finally get

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_{A,s}\nabla_{A,s} + \nabla_{A,t}\nabla_{A,t})v_s = &-R(v_s,v_t)v_t - (\mathrm{D}_{A,s}\nabla)(v_t)\,v_t + (\mathrm{D}_{A,t}\nabla)(v_s)\,v_t \\ &+ \partial_s(\lambda^2)J\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) + \partial_t(\lambda^2)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) + \lambda^2(\nabla_{v_s}J)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) + \lambda^2(\delta_{A,s}J)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) \\ &+ \lambda^2 J\nabla_{v_s}X_{\mu(u)}(u) + 2\lambda^2\nabla_{v_t}X_{\mu(u)}(u) - \lambda^2 J\,\mathrm{L}_u\mathrm{L}_u^*Jv_s + \lambda^2\,\mathrm{L}_u\mathrm{L}_u^*v_s \\ &+ J(\delta_{A,s}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s + (\delta_{A,t}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s - (\delta_{A,s}J)(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s - (\delta_{A,s}J)(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s \\ &- (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t + (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s - (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t + (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s.\end{aligned}$$

□

We may now proceed with the computation of Formula (2.14). Using Lemma 2.6 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\big(|v_s|^2\big) = &\,2\,|\nabla_{A,s}v_s|^2 + 2\,|\nabla_{A,t}v_s|^2 - 2\,\langle v_s, R(v_s,v_t)v_t\rangle - 2\,\langle v_s, (\mathrm{D}_{A,s}\nabla)(v_t)\,v_t\rangle \\ &+ 2\,\langle v_s, (\mathrm{D}_{A,t}\nabla)(v_s)\,v_t\rangle + 2\,\partial_s(\lambda^2)\langle v_s, J\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle + 2\,\partial_t(\lambda^2)\langle v_s, \mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle \\ &+ 2\lambda^2\langle v_s, (\nabla_{v_s}J)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle + 2\lambda^2\langle v_s, (\delta_{A,s}J)\,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle + 2\lambda^2\langle v_s, J\nabla_{v_s}X_{\mu(u)}(u)\rangle \\ &+ 4\lambda^2\langle v_s, \nabla_{v_t}X_{\mu(u)}(u)\rangle - 2\lambda^2\langle v_s, J\,\mathrm{L}_u\mathrm{L}_u^*Jv_s\rangle + 2\lambda^2\langle v_s, \mathrm{L}_u\mathrm{L}_u^*v_s\rangle \\ &+ 2\,\langle v_s, J(\delta_{A,s}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle + 2\,\langle v_s, (\delta_{A,t}J)\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle - 2\,\langle v_s, (\delta_{A,s}J)(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s\rangle \\ &- 2\,\langle v_s, (\delta_{A,s}J)(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s\rangle - 2\,\langle v_s, (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t\rangle + 2\,\langle v_s, (\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,t}J))\,v_s\rangle \\ &- 2\,\langle v_s, (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t\rangle + 2\,\langle v_s, (\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle + 4\,\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_t, \nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&+4\,\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_t,\nabla_{A,t}v_s\rangle+\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s,(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s\rangle+\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s,(\nabla_{v_t}J)v_s\rangle\\&+\langle v_t,(\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle+\langle v_t,(\nabla_{v_t}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle+\langle v_t,(\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle+\langle v_t,(\delta_{A,t}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

By the first vortex equation (2.11) and the definition of the bilinear form ρ above,

$$\langle v_s,J\nabla_{v_s}X_{\mu(u)}(u)\rangle=-\langle Jv_s,\nabla_{v_s}X_{\mu(u)}(u)\rangle=-\langle v_t,\nabla_{v_s}X_{\mu(u)}(u)\rangle=\langle\mu(u),-\rho(v_s,v_t)\rangle$$

and

$$\langle v_s,\nabla_{v_t}X_{\mu(u)}(u)\rangle=\langle\mu(u),\rho(v_t,v_s)\rangle.$$

Plugging this into the previous expression and using Lemma A.1 (iv), Lemma A.4 (iii) and the first vortex equation (2.11) we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\big(|v_s|^2\big)&=2\,|\nabla_{A,s}v_s|^2+2\,|\nabla_{A,t}v_s|^2-2\,\langle v_s,R(v_s,v_t)v_t\rangle-2\,\langle v_s,(\mathrm{D}_{A,s}\nabla)(v_t)\,v_t\rangle\\&\quad+2\,\langle v_s,(\mathrm{D}_{A,t}\nabla)(v_s)\,v_t\rangle-2\,\partial_s(\lambda^2)\langle\mu(u),\mathrm{L}_u^*v_t\rangle+2\,\partial_t(\lambda^2)\langle\mu(u),\mathrm{L}_u^*v_s\rangle\\&\quad-2\lambda^2\langle(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle+2\lambda^2\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle+2\lambda^2\langle\mu(u),2\rho(v_t,v_s)-\rho(v_s,v_t)\rangle\\&\quad+2\lambda^2|\mathrm{L}_u^*v_t|^2+2\lambda^2|\mathrm{L}_u^*v_s|^2-2\,\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_t,\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle+2\,\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s,\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle\\&\quad-2\,\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s,(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s\rangle-2\,\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s,(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s\rangle-2\,\langle v_s,(\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t\rangle\\&\quad+2\,\langle v_s,(\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,t}J))\,v_s\rangle-2\,\langle v_s,(\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t\rangle+2\,\langle v_s,(\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle\\&\quad+4\,\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_t,\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle+4\,\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_t,\nabla_{A,t}v_s\rangle+\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s,(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s\rangle\\&\quad+\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s,(\nabla_{v_t}J)v_s\rangle+\langle v_t,(\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle+\langle v_t,(\nabla_{v_t}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle\\&\quad+\langle v_t,(\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle+\langle v_t,(\delta_{A,t}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Cancelling and rearranging terms we finally get

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\big(|v_s|^2\big)&=2\,|\nabla_{A,s}v_s|^2+2\,|\nabla_{A,t}v_s|^2-2\,|(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s|^2-2\,\langle v_s,R(v_s,v_t)v_t\rangle\\&\quad-2\,\langle v_s,(\mathrm{D}_{A,s}\nabla)(v_t)\,v_t\rangle+2\,\langle v_s,(\mathrm{D}_{A,t}\nabla)(v_s)\,v_t\rangle-2\,\partial_s(\lambda^2)\langle\mu(u),\mathrm{L}_u^*v_t\rangle\\&\quad+2\,\partial_t(\lambda^2)\langle\mu(u),\mathrm{L}_u^*v_s\rangle-2\lambda^2\langle(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle+2\lambda^2\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s,\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle\\&\quad+2\lambda^2\langle\mu(u),2\rho(v_t,v_s)-\rho(v_s,v_t)\rangle+2\lambda^2|\mathrm{L}_u^*v_t|^2+2\lambda^2|\mathrm{L}_u^*v_s|^2\\&\quad+2\,\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_t,\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle+2\,\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s,\nabla_{A,s}v_s\rangle+4\,\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_t,\nabla_{A,t}v_s\rangle\\&\quad-2\,\langle v_s,(\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t\rangle+2\,\langle v_s,(\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle+\langle v_t,(\nabla_{v_t}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle\\&\quad+\langle v_t,(\nabla_{v_s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle-\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s,(\nabla_{v_s}J)v_s\rangle+\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s,(\nabla_{v_t}J)v_s\rangle\\&\quad-2\,\langle v_s,(\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_t\rangle+2\,\langle v_s,(\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle\\&\quad+\langle v_t,(\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J))v_s\rangle+\langle v_t,(\delta_{A,t}(\delta_{A,t}J))v_s\rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{2.21}$$

Next we consider the second term $\Delta(\lambda^2|\mu(u)|^2)$ in (2.13). This term was computed by Gaio and Salamon [4], Section 9, in the case where J_z does not depend on the point z. Generalizing their formula to our situation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\lambda^2|\mu(u)|^2)&=\Delta(\lambda^2)|\mu(u)|^2+4\,\partial_t(\lambda^2)\langle\mu(u),\mathrm{L}_u^*v_s\rangle-4\,\partial_s(\lambda^2)\langle\mu(u),\mathrm{L}_u^*Jv_s\rangle\\&\quad+2\lambda^2|\mathrm{L}_u^*v_s|^2+2\lambda^2|\mathrm{L}_u^*v_t|^2+2\lambda^4|\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)|^2-2\lambda^2\langle\mu(u),\rho(v_s,v_t)-\rho(v_t,v_s)\rangle\end{aligned}$$

$$- 2\lambda^2\langle\mu(u), \mathrm{L}_u^* J(\delta_{A,s}J)v_t\rangle + 2\lambda^2\langle\mu(u), \mathrm{L}_u^* J(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s\rangle. \quad (2.22)$$

Here we use the relation

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla_{A,t}\,\mathrm{L}_u^* v_s - \nabla_{A,s}\,\mathrm{L}_u^* v_t \\ &= \mathrm{L}_u^*\big(\nabla_{A,t}v_s - \nabla_{A,s}v_t\big) + \rho(v_t, v_s) - \rho(v_s, v_t) - \mathrm{L}_u^* J(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s + \mathrm{L}_u^* J(\delta_{A,s}J)v_t \\ &= \lambda^2\,\mathrm{L}_u^*\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u) + \rho(v_t, v_s) - \rho(v_s, v_t) - \mathrm{L}_u^* J(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s + \mathrm{L}_u^* J(\delta_{A,s}J)v_t \end{aligned}$$

which is a direct consequence of Lemma A.9, Lemma 2.5 (i) and the second vortex equation (2.11). Now by Lemma A.4 (ii),(i) and the first vortex equation (2.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &- 2\lambda^2\langle\mu(u), \mathrm{L}_u^* J(\delta_{A,s}J)v_t\rangle + 2\lambda^2\langle\mu(u), \mathrm{L}_u^* J(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s\rangle \\ &= -2\lambda^2\langle J(\delta_{A,s}J)v_t, \mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle + 2\lambda^2\langle J(\delta_{A,t}J)v_s, \mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle \\ &= -2\lambda^2\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s, \mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle - 2\lambda^2\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_t, \mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into Formula (2.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\lambda^2|\mu(u)|^2) &= 2\lambda^2|\mathrm{L}_u^* v_t|^2 + 2\lambda^2|\mathrm{L}_u^* v_s|^2 - 4\,\partial_s(\lambda^2)\langle\mu(u), \mathrm{L}_u^* v_t\rangle + 4\,\partial_t(\lambda^2)\langle\mu(u), \mathrm{L}_u^* v_s\rangle \\ &\quad + \Delta(\lambda^2)|\mu(u)|^2 + 2\lambda^4|\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)|^2 - 2\lambda^2\langle\mu(u), \rho(v_s, v_t) - \rho(v_t, v_s)\rangle \\ &\quad - 2\lambda^2\langle(\delta_{A,s}J)v_s, \mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle - 2\lambda^2\langle(\delta_{A,t}J)v_t, \mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)\rangle. \quad (2.23) \end{aligned}$$

Inserting (2.21) and (2.23) into Formula (2.13) and rearranging terms, we obtain the claimed Formula (2.12) for the Laplacian of the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy density. This completes the proof of Claim 1.

The second part of the proof of Proposition 2.3 is to prove the following claim.

Claim 2. *There exists a constant $c > 0$, not depending on e, such that the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy density satisfies the partial differential inequality*

$$\Delta e \geq -c\left(e + e^2\right).$$

We begin by noting that, from the first vortex equation (2.11), we have

$$|v_s| = |-Jv_t| = |v_t|\,.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Formula (2.12), we immediately obtain the straightforward estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta e \geq\, & 2\,|\nabla_{A,s}v_s|^2 + 2\,|\nabla_{A,t}v_s|^2 - 2\,|(\delta_{A,s}J)|^2\,|v_s|^2 - 2\,\|R\|\,|v_s|^4 \\ & - 2\,\|\mathrm{D}_{A,s}\nabla\|\,|v_s|^4 - 2\,\|\mathrm{D}_{A,t}\nabla\|\,|v_s|^4 - 6\,\partial_s(\lambda^2)\,|\mu(u)|\,|\mathrm{L}_u^* v_t| \\ & - 6\,\partial_t(\lambda^2)\,|\mu(u)|\,|\mathrm{L}_u^* v_s| - 2\lambda^2\|\nabla J\|\,|\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)|\,|v_s|^2 - 2\lambda^2\|\delta_{A,t}J\|\,|\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)|\,|v_s| \\ & + 2\lambda^4\,|\mathrm{L}_u\mu(u)|^2 - 10\lambda^2\,|\mu(u)|\,\|\rho\|\,|v_s|^2 + \Delta(\lambda^2)\,|\mu(u)|^2 + 4\lambda^2\,|\mathrm{L}_u^* v_t|^2 + 4\lambda^2\,|\mathrm{L}_u^* v_s|^2 \\ & - 2\,\|\delta_{A,s}J\|\,|\nabla_{A,s}v_s|\,|v_s| - 2\,\|\delta_{A,t}J\|\,|\nabla_{A,s}v_s|\,|v_s| - 4\,\|\delta_{A,t}J\|\,|\nabla_{A,t}v_s|\,|v_s| \\ & - 3\,\|\nabla(\delta_{A,s}J)\|\,|v_s|^3 - 3\,\|\nabla(\delta_{A,t}J)\|\,|v_s|^3 - \|\delta_{A,s}J\|\|\nabla J\|\,|v_s|^3 - \|\delta_{A,t}J\|\|\nabla J\|\,|v_s|^3 \end{aligned}$$

$$- 3 \left\| \delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s} J) \right\| |v_s|^2 - 2 \left\| \delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,t} J) \right\| |v_s|^2 - \left\| \delta_{A,t}(\delta_{A,t} J) \right\| |v_s|^2 .$$

Here we denote pointwise operator norms by $\|\cdot\|$. We proceed by estimating this further using Young's inequality. We begin with the 5th and 6th term. Recall that

$$\mathrm{D}_{A,v} \nabla = \mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}} \circ \delta_{A,v} J$$

for $v \in TD$, where $\mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}}$ is the derivative of the map $\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}} \colon \mathcal{J}(M, \omega) \ni I \mapsto \nabla_I$. Hence

$$\|\mathrm{D}_{A,v} \nabla\| \leq \left\| \mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}} \right\| \|\delta_{A,v} J\|$$

for $v \in TD$, which implies that

$$\|\mathrm{D}_{A,s} \nabla\| \leq \left\| \mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}} \right\|^2 + \|\delta_{A,s} J\|^2$$

and

$$\|\mathrm{D}_{A,t} \nabla\| \leq \left\| \mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}} \right\|^2 + \|\delta_{A,t} J\|^2 .$$

Next for the 7th and 8th term we have

$$\begin{aligned} 6\, \partial_s(\lambda^2) \, |\mu(u)| \, |\mathrm{L}_u^* v_t| &\leq \frac{9 \left(\partial_s(\lambda^2) \, |\mu(u)|\right)^2}{4\lambda^2} + 4\lambda^2 \left|\mathrm{L}_u^* v_t\right|^2 \\ &= 9 \left(\partial_s \lambda\right)^2 |\mu(u)|^2 + 4\lambda^2 \left|\mathrm{L}_u^* v_t\right|^2 \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$6\, \partial_t(\lambda^2) \, |\mu(u)| \; |\mathrm{L}_u^* v_s| \leq 9 \left(\partial_t \lambda\right)^2 |\mu(u)|^2 + 4\lambda^2 \left|\mathrm{L}_u^* v_s\right|^2 .$$

For the 9th and 10th term we get, respectively,

$$2\lambda^2 \|\nabla J\| \, |\mathrm{L}_u \mu(u)| \, |v_s|^2 \leq \|\nabla J\|^2 \, |v_s|^4 + \lambda^4 \left|\mathrm{L}_u \mu(u)\right|^2$$

and

$$2\lambda^2 \|\delta_{A,t} J\| \; |\mathrm{L}_u \mu(u)| \, |v_s| \leq \|\delta_{A,t} J\|^2 \, |v_s|^2 + \lambda^4 \left|\mathrm{L}_u \mu(u)\right|^2 .$$

For the 12th term,

$$10\lambda^2 \, |\mu(u)| \, \|\rho\| \, |v_s|^2 \leq \lambda^4 \, |\mu(u)|^2 + 25 \, \|\rho\|^2 \, |v_s|^4 .$$

For the 16th, 17th and 18th term,

$$2 \, \|\delta_{A,s} J\| \, |\nabla_{A,s} v_s| \, |v_s| \leq \|\delta_{A,s} J\|^2 \, |v_s|^2 + |\nabla_{A,s} v_s|^2 ,$$

$$2 \, \|\delta_{A,t} J\| \, |\nabla_{A,s} v_s| \, |v_s| \leq \|\delta_{A,t} J\|^2 \, |v_s|^2 + |\nabla_{A,s} v_s|^2$$

and

$$4 \, \|\delta_{A,t} J\| \, |\nabla_{A,t} v_s| \, |v_s| \leq 2 \, \|\delta_{A,t} J\|^2 \, |v_s|^2 + 2 \; |\nabla_{A,t} v_s|^2 .$$

For the 19th and 20th term,

$$\|\nabla(\delta_{A,s} J)\| \, |v_s| \leq \|\nabla(\delta_{A,s} J)\|^2 + |v_s|^2$$

and

$$\|\nabla(\delta_{A,t} J)\| \, |v_s| \leq \|\nabla(\delta_{A,t} J)\|^2 + |v_s|^2 .$$

Finally, for the 21st and 22nd term, we have

$$\|\delta_{A,s} J\| \|\nabla J\| \, |v_s| \leq \|\delta_{A,s} J\|^2 + \|\nabla J\|^2 \, |v_s|^2$$

and

$$\|\delta_{A,t}J\|\|\nabla J\|\,|v_s| \leq \|\delta_{A,t}J\|^2 + \|\nabla J\|^2\,|v_s|^2\,.$$

Applying all these inequalities and using the identity $|\mathrm{d}\lambda|^2 = (\partial_s\lambda)^2 + (\partial_t\lambda)^2$, we may estimate Δe further by

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta e \geq &-25\left(\|R\| + \|\rho\|^2 + \|\nabla J\|^2 + \left\|\mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}}\right\|^2 + \|\delta_{A,s}J\|^2 + \|\delta_{A,t}J\|^2 + 1\right)|v_s|^4\\ &-\Big(\lambda^{-2}\big(9\,|\mathrm{d}\lambda|^2 - \Delta(\lambda^2)\big) + \lambda^2\Big)\lambda^2\,|\mu(u)|^2 - 5\,\Big(\|\delta_{A,s}J\|^2 + \|\delta_{A,t}J\|^2 + \|\nabla(\delta_{A,s}J)\|^2\\ &\qquad + \|\nabla(\delta_{A,t}J)\|^2 + \|\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J)\| + \|\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,t}J)\| + \|\delta_{A,t}(\delta_{A,t}J)\|\Big)\,|v_s|^2\,.\end{aligned}$$

Since the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy density is given by

$$e = |v_s|^2 + \lambda^2\,|\mu(u)|^2\,,$$

we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta e \geq &-25\left(\|R\| + \|\rho\|^2 + \|\nabla J\|^2 + \left\|\mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}}\right\|^2 + \|\delta_{A,s}J\|^2 + \|\delta_{A,t}J\|^2 + 1\right)e^2\\ &-\Big(\lambda^{-2}\big(9\,|\mathrm{d}\lambda|^2 - \Delta(\lambda^2)\big) + \lambda^2\Big)e - 5\,\Big(\|\delta_{A,s}J\|^2 + \|\delta_{A,t}J\|^2 + \|\nabla(\delta_{A,s}J)\|^2\\ &\qquad + \|\nabla(\delta_{A,t}J)\|^2 + \|\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J)\| + \|\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,t}J)\| + \|\delta_{A,t}(\delta_{A,t}J)\|\Big)e.\end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

This can be estimated further in the following way. Because the domain of the smooth function $\lambda\colon B \to (0,\infty)$ is compact, it follows that there exists an upper bound $c_1 > 0$, not depending on e, such that

$$\lambda^{-2}\big(9\,|\mathrm{d}\lambda|^2 - \Delta(\lambda^2)\big) + \lambda^2 \leq c_1 \tag{2.25}$$

pointwise on B. Likewise, the smooth family $J\colon B \to \mathcal{J}_G(M,\omega)$ has compact parameter space, so there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$, not depending on e, such that

$$\|R_z\| + \|\rho_z\|^2 + \|\nabla J_z\|^2 + \left\|\mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}}\right\|^2 \leq c_2 \tag{2.26}$$

for all $z \in B$. Here we used that $\|\mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}}\|$ is a constant not depending on e. It remains to estimate the terms involving A-twisted derivatives. So consider the first order twisted derivatives of J. Since J is assumed to be G-invariant, we have by definition

$$\delta_{A,v}J = \mathrm{d}J(v) - \mathcal{L}_{X_{A(v)}}J = \mathrm{d}J(v)$$

for $v \in TB$. By compactness of B it follows that there exists a constant $c_3 > 0$, not depending on e, such that

$$\|\delta_{A,v}J\| \leq c_3\,|v|\,.$$

In particular, taking v to be one of the coordinate vector fields ∂s or ∂t we obtain

$$\|\delta_{A,s}J\| \leq c_3 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\delta_{A,t}J\| \leq c_3 \tag{2.27}$$

pointwise on B. As for the second order derivatives of J, a similar argument shows that there exist constants $c_4, c_5 > 0$, not depending on e, such that

$$\|\nabla(\delta_{A,s}J)\| = \|\nabla\big(\mathrm{d}J(\partial s)\big)\| \leq c_4 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla(\delta_{A,t}J)\| = \|\nabla\big(\mathrm{d}J(\partial t)\big)\| \leq c_5 \tag{2.28}$$

pointwise on B. In order to estimate the remaining second order twisted derivatives of J, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.7. *There exists a constant $C > 0$, not depending on (Φ, Ψ, u), and a gauge transformation $g \in C^1(B, G)$ such that*

$$\big\|g^*A\big\|_{C^0(B)} \leq C.$$

Proof. Let $p > 2$. Recall the second vortex equation (2.1)

$$F_A = \big(\partial_s\Psi - \partial_t\Phi + [\Phi, \Psi]\big)\,\mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t = -\lambda^2\,\mu(u)\,\mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t. \tag{2.29}$$

From this we see that the constant

$$c_{\lambda,\mu} := \max_{z \in B} \lambda^2(z) \cdot \max_{x \in M} |\mu(x)|_{\mathfrak{g}}$$

yields a uniform curvature bound

$$\big\|F_A\big\|_{L^p(B)} = \left(\int_B |F_A|^p\right)^{1/p} \leq \pi^{1/p} \cdot c_{\lambda,\mu}.$$

Hence by Uhlenbeck compactness (Theorem A in [22]) there exists a constant $C' > 0$, not depending on (Φ, Ψ, u), and a gauge transformation $g \in W^{2,p}(B, G)$ such that

$$\big\|g^*A\big\|_{W^{1,p}(B)} \leq C'.$$

By Rellich's theorem (Theorem B.2 (iii) in [22]), it now follows that g is actually of class C^1 and that there exists a constant $C > 0$, not depending on (Φ, Ψ, u), such that

$$\big\|g^*A\big\|_{C^0(B)} \leq C,$$

as required. □

So by the last lemma we may now pick a constant $C > 0$, not depending on (Φ, Ψ, u), and a gauge transformation $g \in C^1(B, G)$ such that

$$\big\|g^*A\big\|_{C^0(B)} \leq C. \tag{2.30}$$

To estimate the second order twisted derivatives of J we first note that, by G-invariance of J,

$$\|\delta_{A,w}(\delta_{A,v}J)\| = \|g^*\delta_{A,w}(\delta_{A,v}J)\|$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} g^*\delta_{A,w}(\delta_{A,v}J) &= \delta_{g^*A,w}(g^*\delta_{A,v}J) \\ &= \delta_{g^*A,w}\big(\delta_{g^*A,v}\,(g^*J)\big) \\ &= \delta_{g^*A,w}\big(\delta_{g^*A,v}\,J\big) \\ &= \delta_{g^*A,w}\big(\mathrm{d}J(v)+\mathcal{L}_{X_{g^*A(v)}}J\big) \\ &= \mathrm{d}\big(\mathrm{d}J(v)\big)(w)+\mathcal{L}_{X_{g^*A(w)}}\big(\mathrm{d}J(v)\big)+\mathcal{L}_{X_{g^*A(w)}}\big(\mathcal{L}_{X_{g^*A(v)}}J\big) \end{aligned}$$

for $v, w \in TB$. We hence obtain an estimate

$$\big\|\delta_{A,w}(\delta_{A,v}J)\big\| \leq \big\|\mathrm{d}\big(\mathrm{d}J(v)\big)(w)\big\| + \big\|\mathcal{L}_{X_{g^*A(w)}}\big(\mathrm{d}J(v)\big)\big\| + \big\|\mathcal{L}_{X_{g^*A(w)}}\big(\mathcal{L}_{X_{g^*A(v)}}J\big)\big\|. \tag{2.31}$$

As above, by compactness of B it follows that there exists a constant $c_6(v) > 0$, depending on v but not on e, such that

$$\big\|\mathrm{d}\big(\mathrm{d}J(v)\big)(w)\big\| \leq c_6(v)\cdot|w|\,.$$

To estimate the remaining terms, we first observe that the map

$$\mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)), \qquad \eta \mapsto \mathcal{L}_{X_\eta}J$$

is linear. Hence, by compactness of B and Inequality (2.30) there exists a constant $c_7(v) > 0$, depending on v but not on e, such that

$$\big\|\mathcal{L}_{X_{g^*A(w)}}\big(\mathrm{d}J(v)\big)\big\| \leq c_7(v)\cdot\big|g^*A(w)\big| \leq c_7(v)\cdot C\cdot|w|\,.$$

Second, we note that the map

$$\mathfrak{g}\times\mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow C^\infty(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)), \qquad (\eta,\xi) \mapsto \mathcal{L}_{X_\eta}(\mathcal{L}_{X_\xi}J)$$

is bilinear. As before, there exists a constant $c_8 > 0$, not depending on e, such that

$$\big\|\mathcal{L}_{X_{g^*A(w)}}\mathcal{L}_{X_{g^*A(v)}}J\big\| \leq c_8\cdot\big|g^*A(v)\big|\cdot\big|g^*A(w)\big| \leq c_8\cdot C^2\cdot|v|\,|w|\,.$$

Applying all these inequalities to Inequality (2.31), we see that there exist constants $c_9, c_{10}, c_{11} > 0$, not depending on e, such that

$$\|\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,s}J)\| \leq c_9, \quad \|\delta_{A,s}(\delta_{A,t}J)\| \leq c_{10}, \quad \|\delta_{A,t}(\delta_{A,t}J)\| \leq c_{11}. \tag{2.32}$$

Applying estimates (2.25), (2.26), (2.27), (2.28) and (2.32) to Inequality (2.24) above, we finally conclude that there exists a constant $c > 0$, not depending on e, such that

$$\Delta e \geq -c\big(e+e^2\big).$$

This proves Claim 2, and completes the proof of Proposition 2.3.

3. REMOVAL OF SINGULARITIES

The goal of this section is to prove the Removable Singularity Theorem 1.1. Our proof is inspired by the proof of removal of singularities for punctured pseudoholomorphic curves in McDuff and Salamon [16], Section 4.5.

Let us briefly recall the set-up from Section 1. We denote by $B \subset \mathbb{C}$ the closed unit disc and write the coordinate on $\mathbb{C}$ as $z = s + \mathrm{i}\, t$. Fix a smooth family $J\colon B \to \mathcal{J}_G(M,\omega)$ of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M and a positive smooth function $\lambda\colon B \to (0,\infty)$. Let (Φ, Ψ, u) be a smooth vortex on the punctured disc $B \setminus \{0\}$. It will be convenient throughout this section to write formulas in terms of the smooth connection 1-form

$$A := \Phi\, \mathrm{d}s + \Psi\, \mathrm{d}t \in \Omega^1\big(B \setminus \{0\}, \mathfrak{g}\big)$$

on $B \setminus \{0\}$ determined by the functions Φ and Ψ. As we have seen in Remark 1.3, we can then write the vortex equations for (Φ, Ψ, u) in the form

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A}(u) = 0, \qquad F_A + \lambda^2\, \mu(u) = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A}(u) := \frac{1}{2}\big(\mathrm{d}_A u + J(u) \circ \mathrm{d}_A u \circ \mathrm{i}\big).$$

In particular, the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of the vortex (Φ, Ψ, u) on an open subset $U \subset B \setminus \{0\}$ is given by

$$E(\Phi, \Psi, u; U) = \int_U \left(\frac{1}{2}\left|\mathrm{d}_A u\right|_J^2 + \left|\mu(u)\right|_{\mathfrak{g}}^2\right) \lambda^2\ \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t. \tag{3.2}$$

As in the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 we suppose that the vortex (Φ, Ψ, u) has the following properties.

(i) Φ and Ψ extend continuously to all of B.

(ii) (Φ, Ψ, u) has finite Yang-Mills-Higgs energy $E(\Phi, \Psi, u) < \infty$.

Assumption (i) means that the connection form A extends continuously to all of B.

We will prove that the map u is of class $W^{1,p}$ on B for every real number $p > 2$. The proof will occupy the remainder of this section.

We begin by introducing some notation. Let $\widetilde{M} := B \times M$ denote the total space of the trivial symplectic fiber bundle over the disc B with fiber M. The map $u\colon B \setminus \{0\} \to M$ then gives rise to a section of this bundle given by

$$\tilde{u}\colon B \setminus \{0\} \longrightarrow \widetilde{M}, \qquad \tilde{u}(z) := \big(z, u(z)\big).$$

The family $J\colon B \to \mathcal{J}_G(M,\omega)$ of almost complex structures on M gives rise to an almost complex structure $\tilde{J}$ on the manifold $\widetilde{M}$ defined by

$$\tilde{J}(v, w) := \big(\mathrm{i}\, v, Jw + J\, X_{A(v)}(x) - X_{A(\mathrm{i}\, v)}(x)\big) \tag{3.3}$$

for $(z,x) \in B \times M$ and $v \in T_zB$, $w \in T_xM$. In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{J}^2(v,w) &= \big(\mathrm{i}^2\, v, J(Jw + J\,X_{A(v)}(x) - X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}(x)) + J\,X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}(x) - X_{A(\mathrm{i}^2\,v)}(x)\big)\\ &= \big(-v, -w - X_{A(v)}(x) - JX_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}(x) + J\,X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}(x) + X_{A(v)}(x)\big)\\ &= -(v,w).\end{aligned}$$

Note at this point that the almost complex structure $\tilde{J}$ is only continuous on $\widetilde{M}$. This follows directly from (3.3) since A is continuous on B.

The first step towards the proof of Theorem 1.1 is the following observation.

Lemma 3.1. *The map* $\tilde{u}\colon B \setminus \{0\} \to \widetilde{M}$ *is* $(\mathrm{i}, \tilde{J})$*-holomorphic.*

Proof. We begin by noting that the differential of the map $\tilde{u}$ is given by

$$\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(v) = \big(v, \mathrm{d}u(v)\big)$$

for $v \in TB$. By the first vortex equation (3.1), we have

$$J\;\mathrm{d}_A u(v) = \mathrm{d}_A u(\mathrm{i}\,v).$$

Whence

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{J}\;\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(v) &= \tilde{J}\big(v, \mathrm{d}u(v)\big)\\ &= \big(\mathrm{i}\,v, J\,\mathrm{d}u(v) + JX_{A(v)}(u) - X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}(u)\big)\\ &= \big(\mathrm{i}\,v, J\,\mathrm{d}_A u(v) - X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}(u)\big)\\ &= \big(\mathrm{i}\,v, \mathrm{d}_A u(\mathrm{i}\,v) - X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}(u)\big)\\ &= \big(\mathrm{i}\,v, \mathrm{d}u(\mathrm{i}\,v)\big)\\ &= \mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(\mathrm{i}\,v).\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\overline{\partial}_{\tilde{J}}(\tilde{u}) = \frac{1}{2}\big(\mathrm{d}\tilde{u} + \tilde{J}(\tilde{u}) \circ \mathrm{d}\tilde{u} \circ \mathrm{i}\big) = 0,$$

which proves the lemma. □

Next we define a symplectic form $\widetilde{\omega}$ on the manifold $\widetilde{M}$ that tames the almost complex structure $\tilde{J}$. It will be defined in terms of the standard symplectic form $\omega_0 := \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t$ on the disc B and the symplectic form ω on M in the following way. We fix a constant $c_A > 1$ such that

$$\big|X_{A(v)}(x)\big|_J \leq \frac{1}{5}\, c_A \cdot |v| \tag{3.4}$$

uniformly for all tangent vectors $v \in TB$ and all points $x \in M$, where $|\cdot|_J$ and $|\cdot|$ denote the norms associated to the metric $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_J$ on M and the standard metric on B, respectively. Such a constant c_A exists by compactness of B and M. We then define

$$\widetilde{\omega} := c_A^2 \cdot \omega_0 \,\oplus\, \omega.$$

Lemma 3.2. *The symplectic form $\widetilde{\omega}$ tames the almost complex structure $\tilde{J}$.*

Proof. Let $(v,w) \in T\widetilde{M}$ be such that $(v,w) \neq 0$. Applying Inequality (3.4), the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Young's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\omega}\big((v,w),\tilde{J}(v,w)\big) &= c_A^2 \cdot \omega_0(v, \mathrm{i}\,v) + \omega\big(w + X_{A(v)}, J(w + X_{A(v)})\big) \\
&\quad - \omega\big(X_{A(v)}, J(w + X_{A(v)})\big) - \omega\big(J(w + X_{A(v)}), JX_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big) \\
&\quad + \omega\big(JX_{A(v)}, JX_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big) \\
&= c_A^2 \cdot |v|^2 + \big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 - \big\langle X_{A(v)}, w + X_{A(v)}\big\rangle_J \\
&\quad - \big\langle J(w + X_{A(v)}), X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big\rangle_J + \big\langle JX_{A(v)}, X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big\rangle_J \\
&\geq c_A^2 \cdot |v|^2 + \big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 - \big|X_{A(v)}\big|_J \big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J \\
&\quad - \big|J(w + X_{A(v)})\big|_J \big|X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big|_J - \big|JX_{A(v)}\big|_J \big|X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big|_J \\
&\geq c_A^2 \cdot |v|^2 + \big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 - 4\big|X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 - \frac{1}{4}\big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4}\big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 - 4\big|X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big|_J^2 - \big|X_{A(v)}\big|_J \big|X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big|_J \\
&\geq c_A^2 \cdot |v|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 - 5\big|X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 - 5\big|X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big|_J^2 \\
&\geq c_A^2 \cdot |v|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 - \frac{1}{5}\,c_A^2 \cdot |v|^2 - \frac{1}{5}\,c_A^2 \cdot |\mathrm{i}\,v|^2 \\
&= c_A^2 \cdot |v|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 - \frac{1}{5}\,c_A^2 \cdot |v|^2 - \frac{1}{5}\,c_A^2 \cdot |v|^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\Big(c_A^2 \cdot |v|^2 + \big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2\Big) > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Let us denote by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\tilde{J}}$ the Riemannian metric on $\widetilde{M}$ associated to the symplectic form $\widetilde{\omega}$ and the almost complex structure $\tilde{J}$, that is,

$$\big\langle (v_1,w_1),(v_2,w_2)\big\rangle_{\tilde{J}} := \frac{1}{2}\Big(\widetilde{\omega}\big((v_1,w_1),\tilde{J}(v_2,w_2)\big) - \widetilde{\omega}\big(\tilde{J}(v_1,w_1),(v_2,w_2)\big)\Big)$$

for $(v_1,w_1),(v_2,w_2) \in T\widetilde{M}$. The norm associated to this metric is then given by

$$\big|(v,w)\big|_{\tilde{J}}^2 = \widetilde{\omega}\big((v,w),\tilde{J}(v,w)\big)$$

for $(v,w) \in T\widetilde{M}$. The next result relates this norm with the metrics on B and M.

Lemma 3.3. *The metric on $\widetilde{M}$ determined by $\widetilde{\omega}$ and $\tilde{J}$ satisfies the relation*

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(|v|^2 + \big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2\right) \leq \big|(v,w)\big|_{\tilde{J}}^2 \leq 3\,c_A^2 \cdot \left(|v|^2 + \big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2\right)$$

for all tangent vectors $(v,w) \in T\widetilde{M}$, where c_A is the constant from (3.4).

Proof. We have already seen in the proof of Lemma 3.2 that

$$\big|(v,w)\big|_{\tilde J}^2 = \widetilde\omega\big((v,w),\tilde J(v,w)\big) \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(|v|^2 + \big|w + X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2\right).$$

A similar computation yields the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde\omega\big((v,w),\tilde J(v,w)\big) &= c_A^2\cdot|v|^2 + \big|w+X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 - \big\langle X_{A(v)}, w+X_{A(v)}\big\rangle_J \\
&\quad - \big\langle J(w+X_{A(v)}), X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big\rangle_J + \big\langle JX_{A(v)}, X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big\rangle_J \\
&\leq c_A^2\cdot|v|^2 + \big|w+X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 + \big|X_{A(v)}\big|_J\big|w+X_{A(v)}\big|_J \\
&\quad + \big|J(w+X_{A(v)})\big|_J\big|X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big|_J + \big|JX_{A(v)}\big|_J\big|X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big|_J \\
&\leq c_A^2\cdot|v|^2 + \big|w+X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 + \big|X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 + \big|w+X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 \\
&\quad + \big|w+X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 + \big|X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big|_J^2 + \big|X_{A(v)}\big|_J\big|X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big|_J \\
&\leq c_A^2\cdot|v|^2 + 3\big|w+X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 + 2\big|X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 + 2\big|X_{A(\mathrm{i}\,v)}\big|_J^2 \\
&\leq c_A^2\cdot|v|^2 + 3\big|w+X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 + c_A^2\cdot|v|^2 + c_A^2\cdot|\mathrm{i}\,v|^2 \\
&= c_A^2\cdot|v|^2 + 3\big|w+X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2 + c_A^2\cdot|v|^2 + c_A^2\cdot|v|^2 \\
&\leq 3\left(c_A^2\cdot|v|^2 + \big|w+X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2\right) \\
&\leq 3\,c_A^2\Big(|v|^2 + \big|w+X_{A(v)}\big|_J^2\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used that $c_A > 1$ by definition. □

Next we derive a mean value inequality for the $\tilde J$-holomorphic curve $\tilde u\colon B\setminus\{0\}\to\widetilde M$ from the a priori estimate for the vortex (Φ,Ψ,u) provided by Theorem 2.1. Note that the mean value inequality of Lemma 4.3.1 in McDuff and Salamon [16] does not apply to the curve $\tilde u$ since the almost complex structure $\tilde J$ is only continuous. Recall first that the energy of the curve $\tilde u$ on an open subset $U\subset B$ is given by

$$E(\tilde u;U) = \frac{1}{2}\int_U |\mathrm{d}\tilde u|_{\tilde J}^2\cdot\lambda^2\ \mathrm{d}s\wedge\mathrm{d}t,$$

where the operator norm $|\mathrm{d}\tilde u|_{\tilde J}$ is understood with respect to the standard metric on B and the metric on $\widetilde M$ determined by $\widetilde\omega$ and $\tilde J$ (see [16], Section 2.2).

Lemma 3.4. *The energy of the curve* $\tilde u\colon B\setminus\{0\}\to\widetilde M$ *is finite, that is,*

$$E(\tilde u,B) < \infty.$$

Moreover, there exist constants $\delta>0$, $C_A>0$ *and* $r_0>0$ *such that for all* $z_0\in B\setminus\{0\}$ *and all* $0<r<r_0$ *such that* $B_r(z_0)\subset B\setminus\{0\}$, *the curve* $\tilde u$ *satisfies the mean value inequality*

$$E\big(\tilde u;B_r(z_0)\big)<\delta \qquad\Longrightarrow\qquad \big|\mathrm{d}\tilde u(z_0)\big|_{\tilde J}^2 \leq \frac{C_A}{r^2}\cdot E\big(\tilde u;B_r(z_0)\big) + C_A.$$

Proof. We start by comparing the energy of the map $\tilde{u}\colon B \setminus \{0\} \to \widetilde{M}$ and the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of the vortex (Φ, Ψ, u). Recall from (3.2) that the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of (Φ, Ψ, u) on $U \subset B$ is given by

$$E(\Phi, \Psi, u; U) = \int_U \left(\frac{1}{2} \left|\mathrm{d}_A u\right|_J^2 + \left|\mu(u)\right|^2 \right) \lambda^2 \, \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t.$$

By Lemma 3.3 we have estimates

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(v)|_{\tilde{J}}^2 &= \left|\big(v, \mathrm{d}u(v)\big)\right|_{\tilde{J}}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\Big(|v|^2 + \left|\mathrm{d}u(v) + X_{A(v)}(u)\right|_J^2 \Big) = \frac{1}{2}\Big(|v|^2 + |\mathrm{d}_A u(v)|_J^2 \Big) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(v)|_{\tilde{J}}^2 &= \left|\big(v, \mathrm{d}u(v)\big)\right|_{\tilde{J}}^2 \\ &\leq 3\, c_A^2 \cdot \Big(|v|^2 + \left|\mathrm{d}u(v) + X_{A(v)}(u)\right|_J^2 \Big) = 3\, c_A^2 \cdot \Big(|v|^2 + |\mathrm{d}_A u(v)|_J^2 \Big), \end{aligned}$$

for all $v \in TB$. Rewriting these estimates in terms of operator norms we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\Big(1 + |\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2 \Big) \leq |\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}|_{\tilde{J}}^2 \leq 3\, c_A^2 \cdot \Big(1 + |\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2 \Big). \tag{3.5}$$

Hence we may estimate the energy of $\tilde{u}$ in terms of the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of (Φ, Ψ, u) by

$$\begin{aligned} E(\tilde{u}; B) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_B |\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}|_{\tilde{J}}^2 \, \lambda^2 \, \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2}\, c_A^2 \cdot \int_B \Big(1 + |\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2 \Big) \lambda^2 \, \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t \\ &= 3\, c_A^2 \int_B \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2 + |\mu(u)|^2 \right) \lambda^2 \, \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t \\ &\qquad\qquad - 3\, c_A^2 \cdot \int_B \left(|\mu(u)|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \right) \lambda^2 \, \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t \\ &\leq 3\, c_A^2 \cdot E(\Phi, \Psi, u) + 3\, c_A^2 \cdot \int_B \left(|\mu(u)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \right) \lambda^2 \, \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right-hand side of this inequality is finite as $E(\Phi, \Psi, u) < \infty$ by assumption (ii). The second term is finite because $|\mu(u)|$ is bounded since M is compact. Hence $E(\tilde{u}; B) < \infty$, which proves the first assertion of the lemma.

To prove the mean value inequality, we fix $z_0 \in B \setminus \{0\}$ and $r > 0$ such that $B_r(z_0) \subset B \setminus \{0\}$. By Theorem 2.1 there exist constants $\delta' > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that the vortex (Φ, Ψ, u) satisfies the a priori estimate

$$E\big(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\big) < \delta' \quad \Longrightarrow \quad e(\Phi, \Psi, u)(z_0) \leq \frac{C}{r^2} \cdot E\big(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\big). \tag{3.6}$$

Define a constant

$$K := \frac{\pi}{2} \cdot \left\|\lambda\right\|^2_{C^0(B)} \cdot \left\|\mu\right\|^2_{C^0(M)} \geq 0.$$

Note that K is finite by compactness of B and M. We next define the constants δ and C_A by

$$\delta := \frac{\delta'}{4} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad C_A := 12\, c_A^2 \cdot C \cdot (K+1) \cdot \left\|\lambda\right\|^{-2}_{C^0(B)} > 0,$$

where c_A is the constant from (3.4). We also set

$$r_0 := \min\left\{ \sqrt{\frac{\delta'}{2K}}, 1 \right\} > 0.$$

Assume now that $r < r_0$ and

$$E\big(\tilde{u}; B_r(z_0)\big) < \delta. \tag{3.7}$$

We then obtain from (3.5) the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} E\big(\tilde{u}; B_r(z_0)\big) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_r(z_0)} |\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}|^2 \; \lambda^2 \; \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \int_{B_r(z_0)} \Big(|\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2 + 1 \Big) \, \lambda^2 \; \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_r(z_0)} \Big(\frac{1}{2} \, |\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2 + |\mu(u)|^2 \Big) \, \lambda^2 \; \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t \\ &\qquad\qquad - \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_r(z_0)} \Big(|\mu(u)|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \Big) \, \lambda^2 \; \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \, E\big(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\big) - \frac{1}{2} \, K \, r^2. \end{aligned}$$

We have thus proved that

$$E\big(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\big) \leq 2 \, E\big(\tilde{u}; B_r(z_0)\big) + K \, r^2. \tag{3.8}$$

Hence it follows from assumption (3.7) that

$$E\big(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\big) < \frac{\delta'}{2} + K \, r^2.$$

Since $r < r_0$ it follows from the definition of r_0 and the previous inequality that

$$E\big(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\big) < \delta',$$

and so the a priori estimate (3.6) implies that

$$e(\Phi, \Psi, u)(z_0) \leq \frac{C}{r^2} \cdot E\big(\Phi, \Psi, u; B_r(z_0)\big).$$

Combining this with the second inequality in (3.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(z_0)|^2 &\leq 3\,c_A^2 \cdot \Big(1 + |\mathrm{d}_A u(z_0)|_J^2\Big)\\ &\leq 6\,c_A^2 \cdot \Big(\frac{1}{2}\,|\mathrm{d}_A u(z_0)|_J^2 + \big|\mu\big(u(z_0)\big)\big|^2\Big) + 3\,c_A^2\\ &= 6\,c_A^2 \cdot e(\Phi,\Psi,u)(z_0)\cdot\lambda^{-2}(z_0) + 3\,c_A^2\\ &\leq \frac{6\,c_A^2\,C\cdot\lambda^{-2}(z_0)}{r^2}\cdot E\big(\Phi,\Psi,u;B_r(z_0)\big) + 3\,c_A^2.\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the relation

$$\frac{1}{2}\,|\mathrm{d}_A u(z_0)|^2 + |\mu(u(z_0))|^2 = e(\Phi,\Psi,u)(z_0)\cdot\lambda^{-2}(z_0)$$

which holds by Formula (1.4). Again applying Inequality (3.8), we obtain from this an estimate

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(z_0)|^2 &\leq \frac{12\,c_A^2\,C\cdot\lambda^{-2}(z_0)}{r^2}\cdot E\big(\tilde{u};B_r(z_0)\big) + 3\big(4\,CK\cdot\lambda^{-2}(z_0)+1\big)\cdot c_A^2\\ &\leq \frac{C_A}{r^2}\cdot E\big(\tilde{u};B_r(z_0)\big) + C_A.\end{aligned}\tag{3.9}$$

□

We shall also need the following isoperimetric inequality for the almost Kähler manifold $\widetilde{M}$ which is taken from Theorem 4.4.1 in [16]. Before we state it, we briefly recall some notation from [16], Section 4.4. For any smooth loop $\gamma\colon\ \partial B \to \widetilde{M}$ we denote by

$$\ell(\gamma) := \int_0^{2\pi} |\dot{\gamma}(\theta)|\,\mathrm{d}\theta$$

its length with respect to the metric $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\tilde{J}}$. If the length $\ell(\gamma)$ is smaller than the injectivity radius of $\widetilde{M}$, then γ admits a smooth local extension $u_\gamma\colon B \to \widetilde{M}$ such that

$$u_\gamma\big(e^{i\theta}\big) = \gamma(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. The local symplectic action of γ is then defined by

$$a(\gamma) := -\int_B u_\gamma^*\,\widetilde{\omega}.$$

Note that it does not depend on the choice of local extension u_γ as long as the length of γ is smaller than the injectivity radius of $\widetilde{M}$. Then the isoperimetric inequality from Theorem 4.4.1 in [16] applies to the manifold $\widetilde{M}$ even though the almost complex structure $\tilde{J}$ is only continuous. In fact, a careful analysis of the proof of Theorem 4.4.1 shows that it does not require the almost complex structure to have more regularity, and so we have proved the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *For every constant* $c > 1/4\pi$ *there exists a constant* $\ell_0 > 0$ *such that*

$$\ell(\gamma) < \ell_0 \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad |a(\gamma)| \leq c \cdot \ell(\gamma)^2$$

for every smooth loop $\gamma\colon\, \partial B \to \widetilde{M}$.

The next result shows how this isoperimetric inequality can be used to estimate the energy of the curve $\tilde{u}$. It is adapted from Lemma 4.5.1 in McDuff and Salamon [16]. First we need some more notation. Let r_0 be the constant of Lemma 3.4. Define a smooth function

$$\varepsilon\colon\, (0, r_0] \to [0, \infty), \qquad \varepsilon(r) := E\big(\tilde{u}; B_r(0)\big) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_r(0)} |\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}|^2,$$

which assigns to every r the energy of the punctured curve $\tilde{u}\colon\, B \setminus \{0\} \to \widetilde{M}$ on the disc $B_r(0)$, and let $\gamma_r\colon\, \partial B \to \widetilde{M}$ denote the loop defined by

$$\gamma_r(\theta) := \tilde{u}\big(re^{i\theta}\big)$$

for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. Note that the function ε is nondecreasing and that $\lim_{r\to 0} \varepsilon(r) = 0$.

Lemma 3.6. *For every constant* $c > 1/4\pi$ *there exists a constant* $r_1 > 0$ *such that*

$$0 < r < r_1 \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \varepsilon(r) \leq c \cdot \ell(\gamma_r)^2.$$

Proof. The proof is adapted from that of Lemma 4.5.1 in [16]. So let $c > 1/4\pi$, let ℓ_0 be the constant from Lemma 3.5, and let δ, C_A and r_0 be the constants from Lemma 3.4. We fix a constant $r_1 > 0$ such that

$$r_1 \leq \min\left\{r_0, \frac{1}{2}\right\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \varepsilon(2r_1) < \min\left\{\delta, \frac{\ell_0^2 - 2\pi^2\, C_A\, r_1^2}{2\pi^2\, C_A}\right\}. \tag{3.10}$$

This is possible since by Lemma 3.4 the energy $\varepsilon(1) = E(\tilde{u})$ is finite and because the function ε is smooth and nondecreasing with $\lim_{r\to 0} \varepsilon(r) = 0$.

Let now $0 < r \leq r_1$. Then $E(\tilde{u}; B_{2r}(0)) = \varepsilon(2r) < \delta$ by Inequality (3.10), so the mean value inequality of Lemma 3.4 yields

$$\big|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big(re^{i\theta}\big)\big|^2 \leq \frac{C_A}{r^2} \cdot \varepsilon(2r) + C_A.$$

Hence the norm of the derivative of γ_r in the direction of θ satisfies an estimate

$$|\dot{\gamma}_r(\theta)| = \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \big|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big(re^{i\theta}\big)\big| \leq \sqrt{\frac{C_A}{2} \cdot \varepsilon(2r) + \frac{C_A}{2} \cdot r^2}.$$

Using Inequality (3.10) we thus infer that the length of the loop γ_r satisfies

$$\ell(\gamma_r) = \int_0^{2\pi} |\dot{\gamma}_r(\theta)|\, \mathrm{d}\theta \leq \sqrt{2\pi^2\, C_A \cdot \varepsilon(2r) + 2\pi^2\, C_A \cdot r^2} < \ell_0. \tag{3.11}$$

Let $0 < \rho \leq r \leq r_1$, and denote by $u_\rho\colon\, B \to \widetilde{M}$ the local extension of the loop γ_ρ defined by the formula

$$u_\rho\big(\rho' e^{i\theta}\big) := \exp_{\gamma_\rho(0)}\big(\rho'\, \xi(\theta)\big)$$

for $0 < \rho' < \rho$ and $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, where the map $\xi\colon [0,2\pi] \to T_{\gamma_\rho(0)}\widetilde{M}$ is determined by the condition

$$\exp_{\gamma_\rho(0)}\big(\xi(\theta)\big) = \gamma_\rho(\theta).$$

We consider the sphere $v_{\rho r}\colon S^2 \to \widetilde{M}$ that is obtained from the restriction of the curve $\tilde{u}\colon B \setminus \{0\} \to \widetilde{M}$ to the annulus $B_r(0) \setminus B_\rho(0)$ by filling in the boundary circles γ_ρ and γ_r with the discs u_ρ and u_r. Since the symplectic form $\widetilde{\omega}$ tames the almost complex structure $\tilde{J}$ by Lemma 3.2, it follows from Lemma 2.2.1 in [16] that the $\tilde{J}$-holomorphic curve $\tilde{u}\colon B_r(0) \setminus B_\rho(0) \to \widetilde{M}$ satisfies the energy identity

$$E\big(\tilde{u}; B_r(0) \setminus B_\rho(0)\big) = \int_{B_r(0)\setminus B_\rho(0)} \tilde{u}^*\,\widetilde{\omega}.$$

The sphere $v_{\rho r}\colon S^2 \to \widetilde{M}$ is contractible because it is the boundary of the 3-ball consisting of the union of the discs $u_s\colon B \to \widetilde{M}$ for $\rho \le s \le r$. Whence

$$0 = \int_{S^2} v_{\rho r}^*\,\widetilde{\omega} = \int_{B_r(0)\setminus B_\rho(0)} \tilde{u}^*\,\widetilde{\omega} + \int_B u_\rho^*\,\widetilde{\omega} - \int_B u_r^*\,\widetilde{\omega}.$$

To understand the minus sign on the right-hand side of this identity note that the discs u_ρ and u_r have different orientation considered as submanifolds of the sphere S^2. Hence we obtain the identity

$$E\big(\tilde{u}; B_r(0) \setminus B_\rho(0)\big) + \int_B u_\rho^*\,\widetilde{\omega} = \int_B u_r^*\,\widetilde{\omega}.$$

Taking the limit $\rho \to 0$, we obtain from this an equality

$$\varepsilon(r) = E\big(\tilde{u}; B_r(0)\big) = \int_B u_r^*\,\widetilde{\omega} = a(\gamma_r),$$

which expresses the energy of the punctured curve $\tilde{u}\colon B \setminus \{0\} \to \widetilde{M}$ in terms of the local symplectic action of the loop γ_r. By Inequality (3.11) we may apply the isoperimetric inequality of Lemma 3.5, whence

$$\varepsilon(r) \le c \cdot \ell(\gamma_r)^2.$$

□

Now we are ready for the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Let $p > 2$ be a real number. Choose $r > 0$ such that

$$r < r_1 \le \frac{1}{2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \varepsilon(2r) < \delta,$$

where r_1 and δ are the constants from Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.4, respectively. Note that the existence of r is guaranteed because $\varepsilon(1) = E(\tilde{u}; B) < \infty$ by Lemma 3.4 and the function ε is smooth and nondecreasing with $\lim_{r\to 0}\varepsilon(r) = 0$.

Let $0 < \rho \leq r$. First of all, note that we may write the function ε in the form

$$\varepsilon(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \int_{B_\rho(0)} |\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \int_0^\rho \rho' \int_0^{2\pi} \big|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big(\rho' e^{i\theta}\big)\big|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta \,\mathrm{d}\rho'.$$

Choose the constant $c > 1/4\pi$ from Lemma 3.6 sufficiently small such that

$$c < \frac{1}{4\pi} + \frac{1}{2\pi\, p}. \tag{3.12}$$

The isoperimetric inequality of Lemma 3.6 then yields

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(\rho) &\leq c \cdot \ell(\gamma_\rho)^2 \\ &= \frac{c\,\rho^2}{2} \cdot \left(\int_0^{2\pi} \big|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big| \,\mathrm{d}\theta \right)^2 \\ &\leq \pi\, c\, \rho^2 \cdot \int_0^{2\pi} \big|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big|^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta \\ &= 2\pi\, c\, \rho \cdot \dot{\varepsilon}(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used Hölder's inequality and the explicit formula for $\varepsilon(\rho)$ given above. Setting

$$\alpha := \frac{1}{4\pi\, c} < 1$$

we may rewrite the previous inequality in the form

$$\frac{2\alpha}{\rho} \leq \frac{\dot{\varepsilon}(\rho)}{\varepsilon(\rho)}.$$

Let $\rho < \rho_1 < r_1$. Integrating this differential inequality from ρ to ρ_1 then yields

$$\left(\frac{\rho_1}{\rho}\right)^{2\alpha} \leq \frac{\varepsilon(\rho_1)}{\varepsilon(\rho)},$$

whence

$$\varepsilon(\rho) \leq c_1 \cdot \rho^{2\alpha}$$

for some constant $c_1 := \rho_1^{-2\alpha} \cdot \varepsilon(\rho_1)$. Applying the mean value inequality of Lemma 3.4 we obtain the estimate

$$\big|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big|^2 \;\leq\; \frac{C_A}{\rho^2} \cdot \varepsilon(2\rho) + C_A \leq c_2 \cdot \rho^{-2(1-\alpha)} + C_A,$$

where C_A is the constant of Lemma 3.4 and $c_2 > 0$ is some constant not depending on ρ and θ. Furthermore

$$\big|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big| \leq \sqrt{c_2} \cdot \rho^{-(1-\alpha)} + \sqrt{C_A}. \tag{3.13}$$

This inequality has two important consequences. First, applying Minkowski's inequality we obtain

$$\left(\int_{B_r(0)} \left|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\right|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \sqrt{c_2}\cdot\left(\int_{B_r(0)} \rho^{-p(1-\alpha)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \sqrt{C_A}\cdot\left(\pi\, r^2\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where the integral

$$\int_{B_r(0)} \rho^{-p(1-\alpha)} = \int_0^r\int_0^{2\pi} \rho^{1-p(1-\alpha)}\,\mathrm{d}\theta\,\mathrm{d}\rho = 2\pi\cdot\int_0^r \rho^{1-p(1-\alpha)}\,\mathrm{d}\rho$$

is finite because

$$p < \frac{2}{1-\alpha}$$

by (3.12) so that $1 - p\,(1-\alpha) > -1$. Thus we conclude that

$$\left(\int_{B_r(0)} \left|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\right|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty.$$

This shows that the derivative of the punctured curve $\tilde{u}\colon B\setminus\{0\}\to\widetilde{M}$ is of class L^p on $B_r(0)$. Second, it follows from (3.13) that the punctured curve $\tilde{u}\colon B\setminus\{0\}\to\widetilde{M}$ extends continuously over zero. In fact, consider any two points $z_1 = r_1e^{i\theta_1}$, $z_2 = r_2e^{i\theta_2}$ in the punctured disc $B_r(0)\setminus\{0\}$ such that $0 < r_1 < r_2 \leq r$ and $\theta_1,\theta_2\in[0,2\pi]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\tilde{u}(z_2)-\tilde{u}(z_1)\right| &\leq \left|\tilde{u}\big(r_2e^{i\theta_2}\big)-\tilde{u}\big(r_1e^{i\theta_2}\big)\right| + \left|\tilde{u}\big(r_1e^{i\theta_2}\big)-\tilde{u}\big(r_1e^{i\theta_1}\big)\right| \\
&\leq \left|\int_{r_1}^{r_2} \mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big(\rho\, e^{i\theta_2}\big)\,\mathrm{d}\rho\right| + \left|\int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2} \mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big(r_1e^{i\theta}\big)\,\mathrm{d}\theta\right| \\
&\leq \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \left|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big(\rho\, e^{i\theta_2}\big)\right|\mathrm{d}\rho + \int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2} \left|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big(r_1e^{i\theta}\big)\right|\mathrm{d}\theta \\
&\leq c_3\cdot\int_{r_1}^{r_2}\Big(\rho^{-(1-\alpha)}+1\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\rho + c_4\cdot\int_{\theta_1}^{\theta_2}\mathrm{d}\theta \\
&= c_3\cdot\Big(r_2^{\alpha}+r_2-r_1^{\alpha}-r_1\Big) + c_4\cdot\big(\theta_2-\theta_1\big) \\
&\leq c_3\cdot\Big((r_2-r_1)^{\alpha}+r_2-r_1\Big) + c_5\cdot\left|e^{i\theta_2}-e^{i\theta_1}\right|
\end{aligned}$$

for constants $c_3, c_4, c_5 > 0$ not depending on z_1 and z_2. As the manifold $\widetilde{M}$ is compact and hence complete, we conclude that $\tilde{u}$ extends continuously over zero. Since the curve $\tilde{u}$ is smooth on the punctured disc $B\setminus\{0\}$, Exercise 4.5.4 in [16] now shows that the weak first derivatives of $\tilde{u}$ exist on $B_r(0)$ and agree with the strong derivatives on $B_r(0)\setminus\{0\}$. Thus $\tilde{u}$ is of class $W^{1,p}$ on the disc $B_r(0)$ and hence on all of B. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

4. Convergence modulo bubbling

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 4.1 below, which establishes a compactness result for vortices, ignoring any bubbling phenomena. Theorem 4.1 constitutes the first part of the proof of Theorem 1.8 on Gromov compactness for vortices. In the case where $G = S^1$, this result was first proved by Mundet i Riera [18]. Also, under the stronger assumption that M is symplectically aspherical it was proved for arbitrary compact Lie group G by Cieliebak, Gaio, Mundet i Riera and Salamon [1].

We begin by recalling some notation introduced in Section 1. Let Σ be a compact Riemann surface endowed with a fixed complex structure j_Σ and a fixed area form dvol_Σ. Let $P \to \Sigma$ be a fixed G-bundle, and denote by $P(\mathfrak{g}) := (P \times \mathfrak{g})/G \to \Sigma$ its adjoint bundle. Let $J\colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M,\omega)$ be a smooth family of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M, and denote the corresponding family of Riemannian metrics on M by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_J := \omega(\cdot, J\cdot)$. A pair $(A,u) \in \mathcal{A}(P) \times C^\infty_G(P,M)$ is called a vortex if it solves the symplectic vortex equations

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A}(u) = 0, \qquad F_A + \mu(u)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = 0.$$

The Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of a vortex (A,u) on an open subset $U \subset \Sigma$ is given by

$$E(A,u;U) = \int_U \left(\frac{1}{2}\left|\mathrm{d}_A u\right|^2 + \left|\mu(u)\right|^2\right)\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma,$$

and we write $E(A,u) = E(A,u;\Sigma)$. For every real number $p > 2$, the group $\mathcal{G}^{2,p}(P)$ of gauge transformations of class $W^{2,p}$ acts on the space $\mathcal{A}^{1,p}(P) \times W^{1,p}_G(P,M)$ of pairs (A,u) of class $W^{1,p}$ from the right by

$$g^*(A,u) := \left(g^{-1}Ag + g^{-1}\,\mathrm{d}g, g^{-1}u\right).$$

The vortex equations and the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy are invariant under this action. For $z_0 \in \Sigma$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we denote by

$$B_\varepsilon(z_0) = \left\{ z \in \Sigma \;\middle|\; |z - z_0| \le \varepsilon \right\}$$

the closed geodesic disc in Σ of radius ε centered at the point z_0, understood with respect to the metric determined by the area form dvol_Σ and the complex structure j_Σ.

The following is the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.1 (Convergence modulo bubbling)**.** *Let (A_ν, u_ν) be a sequence of vortices such that the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy satisfies a uniform bound*

$$\sup_\nu E\big(A_\nu, u_\nu\big) < \infty.$$

Then there exists a smooth vortex (A,u), a real number $p > 2$, a sequence of gauge transformations $g_\nu \in \mathcal{G}^{2,p}(P)$, and a finite set $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_N\} \subset \Sigma$ of bubbling points such that, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the following holds.

(i) *The sequence $g_\nu^* A_\nu$ converges to A weakly in the $W^{1,p}$-topology and strongly in the C^0-topology on Σ.*

(ii) *The sequence* $(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu)$ *converges to* (A, u) *strongly in the* C^∞*-topology on compact subsets of* $\Sigma \setminus Z$.

(iii) *For every* $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ *and every* $\varepsilon > 0$ *such that* $B_\varepsilon(z_j) \cap Z = \{z_j\}$, *the limit*

$$m_\varepsilon(z_j) := \lim_{\nu \to \infty} E\big(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu; B_\varepsilon(z_j)\big)$$

exists and is a continuous function of ε, *and*

$$m(z_j) := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} m_\varepsilon(z_j) \geq \hbar,$$

where $\hbar$ *is the constant of Corollary 2.2.*

(iv) *For every compact subset* $K \subset \Sigma$ *such that* Z *is contained in the interior of* K,

$$E\big(A, u; K\big) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} m(z_j) = \lim_{\nu \to \infty} E\big(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu; K\big).$$

The proof of Theorem 4.1 will occupy the remainder of this subsection. It is inspired by the proofs of Theorem 4.6.1 in McDuff and Salamon [16] and Theorem 3.2 in Cieliebak et. al. [1]. The main novelty of Theorem 4.1 is that we have to deal with possible bubbling since we do not assume M to be symplectically aspherical. In this way Theorem 4.1 crucially relies on the Removable Singularity Theorem 1.1. In the case of circle actions, Theorem 4.1 was first proved by Mundet i Riera [18] using a different approach based on the compactness results for pseudoholomorphic curves obtained by Ivashkovich and Shevchishin [12].

Let us begin by considering a sequence (A_ν, u_ν) of vortices whose Yang-Mills-Higgs energy satisfies a uniform bound

$$\sup_\nu E\big(A_\nu, u_\nu\big) < \infty.$$

We will call a point $z \in \Sigma$ **singular** for the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) if there exists a sequence z^ν of points in Σ converging to z such that

$$\big|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu(z^\nu)\big|_J \longrightarrow \infty.$$

The first step in the proof of Theorem 4.1 is to observe that the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) can have only finitely many singular points. This is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.4 in [1]. However, we will give an alternative proof of this fact using a trick due to K. Wehrheim. It uses an indirect argument based on the a priori estimate of Corollary 2.2, thus avoiding an explicit construction of the bubbles. This is the content of the next lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let* z *be a singular point of the sequence* (A_ν, u_ν). *Then*

$$\liminf_{\nu \to \infty} E\big(A_\nu, u_\nu; B_\varepsilon(z)\big) \geq \hbar$$

for every $0 < \varepsilon \leq R$, *where* $\hbar$ *and* R *are the constants from Corollary 2.2.*

Proof. Let z be a singular point of the sequence (A_ν, u_ν), and assume for contradiction that

$$\liminf_{\nu\to\infty} E\big(A_\nu, u_\nu; B_\varepsilon(z)\big) < \hbar$$

for some $0 < \varepsilon \le R$. Since z is singular there exists a sequence $z^\nu \to z$ such that

$$\big|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu(z^\nu)\big| \longrightarrow \infty.$$

Hence there exists ν_0 such that

$$z^{\nu_0} \in B_{\varepsilon/2}(z), \quad \big|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu(z^{\nu_0})\big| > \frac{8\,C\hbar}{\varepsilon^2} \quad \text{and} \quad E\big(A_\nu, u_\nu; B_{\varepsilon/2}(z^{\nu_0})\big) < \hbar. \tag{4.1}$$

We may therefore apply the a priori estimate from Corollary 2.2 to the vortex (A_ν, u_ν) on the disc $B_{\varepsilon/2}(z^{\nu_0})$, obtaining an estimate

$$\frac{1}{2}\big|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu(z^{\nu_0})\big|^2 \le \frac{1}{2}\big|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu(z^{\nu_0})\big|^2 + \big|\mu(u_\nu(z^{\nu_0}))\big|^2 \le \frac{C}{(\varepsilon/2)^2}\cdot E\big(A_\nu, u_\nu; B_{\varepsilon/2}(z^{\nu_0})\big).$$

Using the third inequality in (4.1), it now follows from this that

$$\big|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu(z^{\nu_0})\big|^2 \le \frac{8\,C\hbar}{\varepsilon^2},$$

contradicting the second inequality in (4.1). □

Since $\sup_\nu E(A_\nu, u_\nu) < \infty$ by assumption, it follows from Lemma 4.2 that the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) has finitely many singular points. More specifically, we have the following result.

Lemma 4.3. *After passing to a subsequence if necessary, the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) has a finite set $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_N\} \subset \Sigma$ of singular points and satisfies*

$$\sup_\nu \big\|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu\big\|_{L^\infty(K)} < \infty$$

for every compact set $K \subset \Sigma \setminus Z$.

Proof. The proof of this lemma is exactly the same as that of the Claim in the proof of Theorem 4.6.1 in [16], however, for the sake of completeness we record it here anyway. Recall that by Lemma 4.2 the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) has finitely many singular points. We may hence assume by induction that, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the set of singular points of the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) contains the set

$$Z_k = \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}.$$

(We start with $k = 0$ and $Z_k = \emptyset$.) If the sequence $\|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu\|_{L^\infty(K)}$ is bounded for every compact set $K \subset \Sigma \setminus Z_k$ then there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, we can choose a compact subset $K \subset \Sigma \setminus Z_k$ such that the sequence $\|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu\|_{L^\infty(K)}$ is unbounded. Then we may take a sequence of points z^ν_{k+1} in K such that

$$\big\|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu\big\|_{L^\infty(K)} = \big|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu(z^\nu_{k+1})\big|\,.$$

After passing to a further subsequence if necessary, we may assume that the sequence z_{k+1}^{ν} converges to a point $z_{k+1} \in \Sigma \setminus Z_k$ and

$$\big|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu(z_{k+1}^{\nu})\big| \longrightarrow \infty.$$

Whence the singular set of this latter subsequence contains the set

$$Z_{k+1} := Z_k \cup \{z_{k+1}\}.$$

Since the number of possible singular points is finite, this completes the proof. $\square$

So by the last lemma, it is no loss of generality to assume that the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) has finitely many singular points

$$Z := \{z_1, \ldots, z_N\}$$

and satisfies

$$\sup_{\nu} \big\|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu\big\|_{L^\infty(K)} < \infty \tag{4.2}$$

for every compact set $K \subset \Sigma \setminus Z$ contained in the complement of the singular points. We are now ready to investigate the convergence properties of the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) more closely. The next lemma is purely gauge-theoretic and of preparatory nature.

Lemma 4.4. *Fix a real number $p > 2$. There exist a pair (A, u) consisting of a connection $A \in \mathcal{A}^{1,p}(P)$ on P and a section $u \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Sigma \setminus Z, P(M))$ defined on $\Sigma \setminus Z$, a smooth reference connection $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}(P)$, and a sequence of gauge transformations $g_\nu \in \mathcal{G}^{2,p}(P)$ such that the following holds.*

- (i) *The connection A is in Coulomb gauge relative to A_0, that is,*

$$\mathrm{d}_{A_0}^*(A - A_0) = 0.$$

- (ii) *After passing to a subsequence if necessary, the sequence $(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu)$ converges to (A, u) in the following sense.*
  - (a) *The sequence $g_\nu^* A_\nu$ converges to A weakly in the $W^{1,p}$-topology and strongly in the C^0-topology on Σ.*
  - (b) *The sequence $g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu$ converges to u weakly in the $W^{1,p}$-topology and strongly in the C^0-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$.*
  - (c) *Every $g_\nu^* A_\nu$ is in Coulomb gauge relative to A, that is,*

$$\mathrm{d}_A^*\big(g_\nu^* A_\nu - A\big) = 0.$$

- (iii) *The Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of the sequence $(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu)$ satisfies a uniform bound*

$$\sup_{\nu} E(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu) < \infty.$$

Proof. Our argument is taken from the proof of Theorem 3.2 in [1]. By assumption, (A_ν, u_ν) is a solution of the second vortex equation

$$F_{A_\nu} = -\mu(u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\,.$$

Since M is compact, the right-hand side of this equation is uniformly bounded in the L^p-norm on Σ, whence the sequence F_{A_ν} is uniformly bounded in the L^p-norm on Σ. Thus, by Uhlenbeck compactness (Theorem A in [22]) there exists a sequence of gauge transformations $h_\nu \in \mathcal{G}^{2,p}(P)$ such that the sequence $h_\nu^* A_\nu$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{A}^{1,p}(P)$ with respect to the $W^{1,p}$-topology. It follows from the Banach-Alaoglu theorem (Theorem V.2.1 in [25]) that there exists a connection $\tilde{A} \in \mathcal{A}^{1,p}(P)$ such that, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the sequence $h_\nu^* A_\nu$ converges to $\tilde{A}$ weakly in the $W^{1,p}$-topology.

Now we apply the local slice theorem (Theorem F in [22], see also Theorem B.1 in [1]). We take $\tilde{A}$ as reference connection and choose a smooth connection $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}(P)$ such that $\|\tilde{A} - A_0\|_{W^{1,p}(\Sigma)}$ (and hence also $\|\tilde{A} - A_0\|_{L^p(\Sigma)}$) is sufficiently small. Then the local slice theorem (taking $q = p$) asserts the existence of a gauge transformation $h \in \mathcal{G}^{2,p}(P)$ such that

$$\mathrm{d}_{\tilde{A}}^*\big(h_* A_0 - \tilde{A}\big) = 0.$$

This implies (see Lemma 8.4 (ii) in [22]) that

$$\mathrm{d}_{h_* A_0}^*\big(\tilde{A} - h_* A_0\big) = 0,$$

whence

$$\mathrm{d}_{A_0}^*\big(h^*\tilde{A} - A_0\big) = h^*\,\mathrm{d}_{h_* A_0}^*\big(\tilde{A} - h_* A_0\big) = 0.$$

Define the connection

$$A := h^*\tilde{A} \in \mathcal{A}^{1,p}(P).$$

Then A is in Coulomb gauge relative to A_0. This proves (i).

We have seen above that $h_\nu^* A_\nu$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{A}^{1,p}(P)$, so $h^* h_\nu^* A_\nu$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{A}^{1,p}(P)$ as well (by continuity of the action of the group of gauge transformations, see [22], Lemma A.6). Hence it follows from the Banach-Alaoglu theorem and Rellich's theorem (Theorem B.2 (iii) in [22]) that, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the sequence $h^* h_\nu^* A_\nu$ converges to A weakly in the $W^{1,p}$-topology and strongly in the C^0-topology. Now we apply the local slice theorem a second time, taking A as reference connection. By what we just proved, we have

$$\lim_{\nu\to\infty} \|h^* h_\nu^* A_\nu - A\|_{L^p(\Sigma)} = 0, \qquad \sup_\nu \|h^* h_\nu^* A_\nu - A\|_{W^{1,p}(\Sigma)} < \infty.$$

Then the local slice theorem (again taking $q = p$) asserts the existence of a sequence of gauge transformations $\hat{h}_\nu \in \mathcal{G}^{2,p}(P)$ such that

$$\mathrm{d}_A^*\big(\hat{h}_\nu^* h^* h_\nu^* A_\nu - A\big) = 0 \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$\lim_{\nu\to\infty}\left\|\hat{h}_\nu^* h^* h_\nu^* A_\nu - A\right\|_{L^p(\Sigma)} = 0, \qquad \sup_\nu \left\|\hat{h}_\nu^* h^* h_\nu^* A_\nu - A\right\|_{W^{1,p}(\Sigma)} < \infty. \tag{4.4}$$

We finally define the desired sequence of gauge transformations by

$$g_\nu := h_\nu h^* \hat{h}_\nu \in \mathcal{G}^{2,p}(P)$$

(see [22], Lemma A.5). Then (4.3) proves (c) in (ii).

Furthermore, by the Banach-Alaoglu theorem and Rellich's theorem it follows from the second estimate in (4.4) that the sequence $g_\nu^* A_\nu$ is uniformly bounded in the $W^{1,p}$-topology, and that, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the sequence $g_\nu^* A_\nu$ converges to A weakly in the $W^{1,p}$-topology and strongly in the C^0-topology. This proves (a) in (ii).

It remains to show convergence for the sequence of sections u_ν. By Hölder's inequality it follows from (4.2) that

$$\sup_\nu \left\|\mathrm{d}_{g_\nu^* A_\nu}\big(g^{-1} u_\nu\big)\right\|_{L^p(K)} = \sup_\nu \left\|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu\right\|_{L^p(K)} \leq \sup_\nu \left\|\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu\right\|_{L^\infty(K)} < \infty$$

for every compact subset $K \subset \Sigma \setminus Z$. Hence, by compactness of M it follows that the sequence $g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu$ is uniformly bounded in the $W^{1,p}$-norm on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$. Thus we conclude from the Banach-Alaoglu theorem and Rellich's theorem that there exists a section $u \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Sigma \setminus Z, P(M))$ that is of class $W^{1,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$, such that, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the sequence $g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu$ converges to u weakly in the $W^{1,p}$-topology and strongly in the C^0-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$. This proves (a) and (b) in (ii).

Lastly, Assertion (iii) follows from the assumption $\sup_\nu E(A_\nu, u_\nu) < \infty$ by gauge invariance of the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy. □

For the rest of this section, let us fix a real number $p > 2$. By Lemma 4.4 (using gauge invariance of the vortex equations) we may henceforth assume without loss of generality that there exists a pair (A, u) consisting of a connection $A \in \mathcal{A}^{1,p}(P)$ on P and a section $u \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Sigma \setminus Z, P(M))$ of $P(M)$ defined on $\Sigma \setminus Z$, and a smooth reference connection $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}(P)$, such that the following holds.

(i') The connection A is in Coulomb gauge relative to A_0, that is,

$$\mathrm{d}_{A_0}^*(A - A_0) = 0.$$

(ii') The sequence (A_ν, u_ν) converges to (A, u) in the following sense.

  (a) The sequence A_ν converges to A weakly in the $W^{1,p}$-topology and strongly in the C^0-topology on Σ.

  (b) The sequence u_ν converges to u weakly in the $W^{1,p}$-topology and strongly in the C^0-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$.

  (c) Every A_ν is in Coulomb gauge relative to A, that is,

$$\mathrm{d}_A^*\big(A_\nu - A\big) = 0.$$

(iii') The Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) satisfies a uniform bound

$$\sup_\nu E(A_\nu, u_\nu) < \infty.$$

Let us note at this point that part (a) of (ii') above proves Assertion (i) of Theorem 4.1.

Next we consider the vortex equations

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A_\nu}(u_\nu) = 0, \qquad F_{A_\nu} + \mu(u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = 0$$

in the limit $\nu \to \infty$ in order to obtain limit equations for the pair (A, u). Since the sequence of sections u_ν only converges on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$, the limit equations will only be defined on $\Sigma \setminus Z$. Using the Removable Singularity Theorem 1.1, we will later be able to write down limit equations for (A, u) that hold on all of Σ.

Lemma 4.5. *The pair (A, u) is a solution of class $W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ of the vortex equations on the complement $\Sigma \setminus Z$ of the singular points.*

Proof. Since the family $J\colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ is smooth, it follows from parts (a)–(b) of (ii') on p. 42 that the sequence of 1-forms

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A_\nu}(u_\nu) = \frac{1}{2}\big(\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu + J(u_\nu) \circ \mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu \circ j_\Sigma\big)$$

converges weakly in the L^p-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$ to the 1-form

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A}(u) = \frac{1}{2}\big(\mathrm{d}_A u + J(u) \circ \mathrm{d}_A u \circ j_\Sigma\big).$$

Likewise, it follows that the sequence of 2-forms

$$F_{A_\nu} + \mu(u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma$$

converges weakly in the L^p-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$ to the 2-form

$$F_A + \mu(u)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\,.$$

On the other hand, every pair (A_ν, u_ν) satisfies the vortex equations

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A_\nu}(u_\nu) = 0, \qquad F_{A_\nu} + \mu(u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = 0.$$

Passing to weak L^p-limits, it thus follows that the pair (A, u) is a solution of class $W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ of the vortex equations

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A}(u) = 0, \qquad F_A + \mu(u)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = 0$$

on the open subset $\Sigma \setminus Z$. □

By the previuous lemma, the limit pair (A, u) is a vortex of class $W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ on $\Sigma \setminus Z$. In order to prove that (A, u) satisfies the vortex equations on all of Σ, we have to apply the Removable Singularity Theorem 1.1. The next result ensures that this theorem actually applies to the pair (A, u).

Lemma 4.6. *The limit pair (A, u) has finite Yang-Mills-Higgs energy $E(A, u) < \infty$.*

Proof. Let $K_\mu \subset \Sigma \setminus Z$ be an exhausting sequence of compact subsets such that

$$K_\mu \subset K_{\mu+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_\mu K_\mu = \Sigma \setminus Z.$$

By parts (a)–(b) of (ii') on p. 42 the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) converges to (A, u) weakly in the $W^{1,p}$-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$. It follows that the sequence of functions

$$e(A_\nu, u_\nu) := \frac{1}{2}\Big(|F_{A_\nu}|^2 + |\mathrm{d}_{A_\nu} u_\nu|^2 + |\mu(u_\nu)|^2\Big)$$

converges to

$$e(A, u) := \frac{1}{2}\Big(|F_A|^2 + |\mathrm{d}_A u|^2 + |\mu(u)|^2\Big)$$

weakly in the $L^{p/2}$-topology on every compact set K_μ. Hence

$$\int_{K_\mu} e(A, u)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = \lim_{\nu\to\infty} \int_{K_\mu} e(A_\nu, u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma$$

for every μ. Moreover, since (A_ν, u_ν) is continuous on Σ,

$$\lim_{\mu\to\infty} \int_{K_\mu} e(A_\nu, u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = \int_{\Sigma\setminus Z} e(A_\nu, u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = \int_\Sigma e(A_\nu, u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = E(A_\nu, u_\nu)$$

for every ν. By Fatou's lemma we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned}
E(A, u) &= \int_\Sigma e(A, u)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma \\
&= \int_{\Sigma\setminus Z} e(A, u)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma \\
&\leq \liminf_{\mu\to\infty} \int_{K_\mu} e(A, u)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma \\
&= \liminf_{\mu\to\infty} \left(\lim_{\nu\to\infty} \int_{K_\mu} e(A_\nu, u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\right) \\
&\leq \sup_\nu \left(\lim_{\mu\to\infty} \int_{K_\mu} e(A_\nu, u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\right) = \sup_\nu E(A_\nu, u_\nu).
\end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality we used that, for ν fixed, the sequence $\int_{K_\mu} e(A_\nu, u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma$ is nondecreasing. Since $\sup_\nu E(A_\nu, u_\nu) < \infty$ by (iii') on p. 43, the claim follows. $\square$

We may now apply the Removable Singularity Theorem 1.1 to the limit pair (A, u).

Lemma 4.7. *The pair (A, u) is a solution of class $W^{1,p}$ of the vortex equations on all of Σ.*

Proof. Let $z_j \in Z$ be a singular point of the sequence (A_ν, u_ν), and choose a holomorphic disc $B \to \Sigma$ such that the singular point z_j gets identified with the origin, where $B \subset \mathbb{C}$ denotes the closed unit disc. As we have seen in Remark 1.3, locally in this chart the vortex (A, u) gets identified with a triple (Φ, Ψ, u) satisfying the vortex equations

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s u + X_\Phi(u) + J\big(\partial_t u + X_\Psi(u)\big) &= 0 \\ \partial_s \Psi - \partial_t \Phi + [\Phi, \Psi] + \lambda^2 \mu(u) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

on the punctured disc $B \setminus \{0\}$. Here the functions $\Phi, \Psi \colon B \to \mathfrak{g}$ are defined by

$$A = \Phi \, \mathrm{d}s + \Psi \, \mathrm{d}t,$$

and the function $\lambda \colon B \to (0, \infty)$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = \lambda^2 \, \mathrm{d}s \wedge \mathrm{d}t.$$

Since A is of class $W^{1,p}$ on Σ, it follows by Rellich's theorem (Theorem B.2 (iii) in [22]) that the functions Φ and Ψ are continuous on all of B. Moreover, the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy $E(\Phi, \Psi, u)$ of the vortex (Φ, Ψ, u) is finite by Lemma 4.6 (see also Remark 1.3). Hence the Removable Singularity Theorem 1.1 implies that the map u is of class $W^{1,p}$ on all of B.

Since the set Z of singular points is finite, we have thus proved that the section $u \colon \Sigma \setminus Z \to P(M)$ extends to a section $u \colon \Sigma \to P(M)$ of class $W^{1,p}$ on Σ. It follows from Lemma 4.5 that (A, u) is a $W^{1,p}$-solution of the vortex equations on all of Σ. □

By the previous lemma, the limit pair (A, u) is a vortex of class $W^{1,p}$ on Σ. It remains to prove that (A, u) is actually smooth and that the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) converges to (A, u) in the C^∞-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$. This is the content of the next result, which will complete the proof of Assertion (ii) of Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose that the limit pair (A, u) is a vortex of class $W^{1,p}$ on Σ. Then the following holds.*

(i) *(A, u) is smooth.*

(ii) *After passing to a subsequence if necessary, the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) converges to (A, u) strongly in the C^∞-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$.*

Proof. The proof is by standard elliptic bootstrapping and is taken from the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [1].

We prove (i) first. Let ℓ be a positive integer. We will prove by induction that A and u are of class $W^{k,p}$ and of class C^k on Σ, for $1 \le k \le \ell + 1$.

For $k = 1$, this is true since (A, u) is of class $W^{1,p}$ on Σ by assumption.

Now suppose that the claim is true for some $1 \leq k \leq \ell$. By assumption, the pair (A, u) solves the vortex equations

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A}(u) = 0, \qquad F_A + \mu(u)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = 0. \tag{4.5}$$

Consider the connection A. Set $\alpha := A - A_0 \in W^{k,p}(\Sigma, T^*\Sigma_0 \otimes P(\mathfrak{g}))$. By (i') on p. 42, there exists a smooth reference connection $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}(P)$ such that A is in Coulomb gauge relative to A_0, that is,

$$\mathrm{d}^*_{A_0}\alpha = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Combining this equation with the second vortex equation in (4.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}_{A_0}\alpha &= \mathrm{d}\alpha + [A_0 \wedge \alpha] \\ &= \mathrm{d}A - \mathrm{d}A_0 + [A_0 \wedge A] - [A_0 \wedge A_0] \\ &= -\Big(\mathrm{d}A_0 + \frac{1}{2}[A_0 \wedge A_0]\Big) - \frac{1}{2}[A_0 \wedge A_0] + [A_0 \wedge A] + \mathrm{d}A \\ &= -F_{A_0} - \frac{1}{2}[\alpha \wedge \alpha] + \frac{1}{2}[A \wedge A] + \mathrm{d}A \\ &= -F_{A_0} - \frac{1}{2}[\alpha \wedge \alpha] + F_A \\ &= -F_{A_0} - \frac{1}{2}[\alpha \wedge \alpha] - \mu(u)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\,.\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Since A and u are of class $W^{k,p}$ by assumption, it follows from Formula (4.7) that $\mathrm{d}_{A_0}\alpha$ is of class $W^{k,p}$. Furthermore, it is obvious from Formula (4.6) that $\mathrm{d}^*_{A_0}\alpha$ is of class $W^{k,p}$. Hence it follows from elliptic regularity for the Hodge-Laplace operator $\mathrm{d}_{A_0}\mathrm{d}^*_{A_0} + \mathrm{d}^*_{A_0}\mathrm{d}_{A_0}$ that α is of class $W^{k+1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}$. Thus $A = A_0 + \alpha$ is of class $W^{k+1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}$. By Rellich's theorem (Theorem B.2 (iii) in [22]), it follows that A is of class C^k.

Next we prove that u is of class $W^{k+1,p}$ and of class C^k. We shall work in local coordinates. Choose a holomorphic coordinate chart $\mathbb{C} \supset D \to \Sigma$ on Σ and a Darboux chart on M, that is, assume without loss of generality that $(M, \omega) = (\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \omega_0)$, where ω_0 is the standard symplectic form on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. By Remark 1.3, with respect to these local coordinates, the first vortex equation takes the form

$$\partial_s u + X_\Phi(u) + J(u)\big(\partial_t u + X_\Psi(u)\big) = 0, \tag{4.8}$$

where we express A as

$$A = \Phi\,\mathrm{d}s + \Psi\,\mathrm{d}t, \qquad \Phi, \Psi\colon D \to \mathfrak{g}$$

and consider $J(u)$ as a matrix-valued map

$$J(u)\colon D \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}. \tag{4.9}$$

We may then rewrite Equation (4.8) as

$$\partial_s u + J(u)\,\partial_t u = -X_\Phi(u) - J(u)X_\Psi(u). \tag{4.10}$$

Since A is of class C^k, so are Φ and Ψ and it follows that the vector fields X_Φ and X_Ψ are of class C^k on D as well. Moreover, since u is of class $W^{k,p}$ it follows from Lemmata B.8 and B.1 in [22] that the map (4.9) is of class $W^{k,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ on D. Hence we conclude that the right-hand side of Equation (4.10) is of class $W^{k,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}$. Applying Proposition B.4.9 (i) in [16] (see also Lemma 3.3 in [1]) it follows that u is of class $W^{k+1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ on D. By Rellich's theorem we infer that u is of class C^k on D. This proves (i).

Now we prove (ii). Let ℓ be a positive integer. We prove by induction that (A_ν, u_ν) converges to (A, u) weakly in the $W^{k,p}$-topology and strongly in the C^{k-1}-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$, for $1 \leq k \leq \ell + 1$.

For $k = 1$, this is true by parts (a)–(b) of (ii') on p. 42.

Now suppose that the claim is true for some $1 \leq k \leq \ell$. We first prove that the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) is uniformly bounded in $W^{k+1,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$. Since (A_ν, u_ν) converges weakly in the $W^{k,p}$-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$, it follows from the Banach-Steinhaus theorem that (A_ν, u_ν) satisfies a uniform $W^{k,p}$-bound on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$.

Consider the sequence A_ν. Set $\alpha_\nu := A_\nu - A \in W^{1,p}(\Sigma \setminus Z, T^*(\Sigma \setminus Z) \otimes P(\mathfrak{g}))$. By part (c) of (ii') on p. 42, every A_ν is in Coulomb gauge relative to A, that is,

$$\mathrm{d}_A^* \alpha_\nu = 0. \tag{4.11}$$

Combining this equation with the second vortex equation $F_{A_\nu} + \mu(u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma = 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d}_A \alpha_\nu &= \mathrm{d}\alpha_\nu + [A \wedge \alpha_\nu] \\
&= \mathrm{d}A_\nu - \mathrm{d}A + \big[A \wedge A_\nu\big] - [A \wedge A] \\
&= -\left(\mathrm{d}A + \frac{1}{2}[A \wedge A]\right) - \frac{1}{2}[A \wedge A] + \big[A \wedge A_\nu\big] + \mathrm{d}A_\nu \\
&= -F_A - \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_\nu \wedge \alpha_\nu] + \frac{1}{2}\big[A_\nu \wedge A_\nu\big] + \mathrm{d}A_\nu \\
&= -F_A - \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_\nu \wedge \alpha_\nu] + F_{A_\nu} \\
&= -F_A - \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_\nu \wedge \alpha_\nu] - \mu(u_\nu)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Since A_ν and u_ν are uniformly bounded in $W^{k,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$, it follows from Formula (4.12) that $\mathrm{d}_A\alpha_\nu$ is uniformly bounded in $W^{k,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$. Furthermore, it is obvious from Formula (4.11) that $\mathrm{d}_A^*\alpha_\nu$ is uniformly bounded in $W^{k,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$. Since A is smooth on Σ by Assertion (i), it follows from elliptic regularity for the Hodge-Laplace operator $\mathrm{d}_A\mathrm{d}_A^* + \mathrm{d}_A^*\,\mathrm{d}_A$ that α_ν is uniformly bounded in $W^{k+1,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$. Thus the sequence $A_\nu = A + \alpha_\nu$ is uniformly bounded in $W^{k+1,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$.

Next we consider the sequence of sections u_ν. As in the proof of Assertion (i) above we shall work in a holomorphic chart $\mathbb{C} \supset D \to \Sigma$ and a Darboux chart on M, that is, we assume without loss of generality that $(M,\omega) = (\mathbb{R}^{2n},\omega_0)$. The first vortex equation then takes the form

$$\partial_s u_\nu + X_{\Phi_\nu}(u_\nu) + J(u_\nu)\big(\partial_t u_\nu + X_{\Psi_\nu}(u_\nu)\big) = 0, \tag{4.13}$$

where we express A_ν as

$$A_\nu = \Phi_\nu\, \mathrm{d}s + \Psi_\nu\, \mathrm{d}t, \qquad \Phi_\nu, \Psi_\nu \colon D \to \mathfrak{g}$$

and consider $J(u_\nu)$ as a matrix-valued map

$$J(u_\nu) \colon D \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n\times 2n}. \tag{4.14}$$

We rewrite Equation (4.13) as

$$\partial_s u_\nu + J(u_\nu)\, \partial_t u_\nu = -X_{\Phi_\nu}(u_\nu) - J(u_\nu) X_{\Psi_\nu}(u_\nu). \tag{4.15}$$

Since A_ν is uniformly bounded in $W^{k+1,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$, Rellich's theorem implies that the sequence A_ν is uniformly bounded in C^k. Hence the vector fields X_{Φ_ν} and X_{Ψ_ν} are uniformly bounded in C^k as well. Moreover, since u_ν is uniformly bounded in $W^{k,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$, it follows from Lemmata B.8 and B.1 in [22] that the maps (4.14) are uniformly bounded in $W^{k,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$. Hence we conclude that the right-hand side of Equation (4.15) is uniformly bounded in $W^{k,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$. Applying Proposition B.4.9 (i) and (ii) in [16] (see also Lemma 3.3 in [1]), it follows that u_ν satisfies a uniform $W^{k+1,p}$-bound on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$. This shows that the sequence u_ν is uniformly bounded in $W^{k+1,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$.

Since (A_ν, u_ν) is uniformly bounded in $W^{k+1,p}$ on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$, it follows from the theorems of Alaoglu and Rellich that there exists a connection A_∞ and a section u_∞, both of class $W^{k+1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ and of class C^k on $\Sigma \setminus Z$, such that, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the sequence (A_ν, u_ν) converges to (A_∞, u_∞) weakly in the $W^{k+1,p}$-topology and strongly in the C^k-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$. Since (A_ν, u_ν) converges to (A, u) strongly in the C^0-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma \setminus Z$ by (ii)(a)–(b), we must necessarily have $A = A_\infty$ and $u = u_\infty$. This completes the inductive step, and finishes the proof of (ii). □

We now prove Assertions (iii) and (iv) of Theorem 4.1. We will proceed along the lines of the proofs of Assertions (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 4.6.1 in [16].

Fix numbers $\varepsilon_j > 0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, N$ such that the geodesic discs $B_{\varepsilon_j}(z_j)$ are pairwise disjoint. Then, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the limits

$$m_{\varepsilon_j}(z_j) := \lim_{\nu\to\infty} E\big(A_\nu, u_\nu; B_{\varepsilon_j}(z_j)\big)$$

exist for $j = 1, \ldots, N$. The function $\varepsilon \mapsto m_\varepsilon(z_j)$ is continuous for $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_j$ since (A_ν, u_ν) converges in C^∞ on the annulus $B_{\varepsilon_j}(z_j) \setminus B_\varepsilon(z_j)$. Recall from Lemma 4.2 that

$$\liminf_{\nu\to\infty} E\big(A_\nu, u_\nu; B_{\varepsilon_j}(z_j)\big) \geq \hbar.$$

Hence it follows that

$$m(z_j) := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} m_\varepsilon(z_j) \geq \hbar.$$

This proves (iii) in Theorem 4.1. To prove (iv), fix a number $\varepsilon \leq \min_j \varepsilon_j$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} E\left(A, u; K \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^N B_\varepsilon(z_j)\right) &= \lim_{\nu \to \infty} E\big(A_\nu, u_\nu; K\big) - \sum_{j=1}^N \lim_{\nu \to \infty} E\big(A_\nu, u_\nu; B_\varepsilon(z_j)\big) \\ &= \lim_{\nu \to \infty} E\big(A_\nu, u_\nu; K\big) - \sum_{j=1}^N m_\varepsilon(z_j). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit $\varepsilon \longrightarrow 0$,

$$E(A, u; K) = \lim_{\nu \to \infty} E\big(A_\nu, u_\nu; K\big) - \sum_{j=1}^N m(z_j).$$

This proves Assertion (iv) and completes the proof of Theorem 4.1.

5. Gromov compactness

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.8 on Gromov compactness for vortices. Our proof is modeled on the proof of Gromov compactness for pseudoholomorphic curves by McDuff and Salamon [16], Theorem 5.3.1. In the case of circle actions, Theorem 1.8 was first proved by Mundet i Riera [18] in a different manner using the compactness results for pseudoholomorphic curves obtained by Ivashkovich and Shevchishin [12].

The strategy of our proof of Theorem 1.8 is to reduce the construction of the limit polystable vortex to the construction of the limit stable curve of a suitably chosen sequence of pseudoholomorphic curves with uniformly bounded energy as in McDuff and Salamon [16]. This requires some preliminary results, which we provide in the next two subsections. In Section 5.1 we apply the graph construction in order to transform vortices into pseudoholomorphic curves. In Section 5.2 we adapt the bubbling analysis from [16] to our situation. The actual proof of Theorem 1.8 is then contained in Section 5.3, where we combine the preliminary results of the previous sections.

We begin by recalling some notation from Section 1. Let Σ be a compact Riemann surface endowed with a fixed complex structure j_Σ and a fixed area form dvol_Σ. Let $\pi\colon P \to \Sigma$ be a fixed G-bundle. Let $J\colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ be a smooth family of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M, and denote the corresponding family of Riemannian metrics on M by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_J := \omega(\cdot, J\cdot)$. The Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of a vortex (A, u) on an open subset $U \subset \Sigma$ is given by

$$E(A, u; U) = \int_U \left(\frac{1}{2} \left| \mathrm{d}_A u \right|_J^2 + \left| \mu(u) \right|_{\mathfrak{g}}^2 \right) \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma,$$

and we write $E(A, u)$ for the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of (A, u) on Σ.

5.1. **Vortices vs. pseudoholomorphic maps.** In this subsection, we apply the graph construction in order to transform vortices into pseudoholomorphic curves. We deduce a mean value inequality for these curves from the a priori estimate for vortices proved in Section 2. The results of this subsection are in preparation for the proof of Theorem 1.8 in Section 5.3.

The main result of this subsection is the following proposition. Recall that we denote by $p\colon P(M)=(P\times M)/G\to\Sigma$ the fiber bundle associated to the G-bundle $P\to\Sigma$ and the G-manifold M.

Proposition 5.1. *Fix a complex structure* j_Σ *and an area form* dvol_Σ *on* Σ*, and let* $J\colon\Sigma\to\mathcal{J}_G(M,\omega)$ *be a smooth family of* G*-invariant* ω*-compatible almost complex structures on* M*. Let* $A_0\in\mathcal{A}(P)$ *be a smooth reference connection on* P*. Then* A_0 *induces a symplectic form* ω_{A_0} *on* $P(M)$*. Moreover, there exist constants* $c,c',c''>0$*,* $r_0>0$*, and* $\delta,C>0$ *such that for all vortices* (A,u) *satisfying*

$$\big\|A-A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)}\le c$$

the following holds.

- (i) *The family* $J\colon\Sigma\to\mathcal{J}_G(M,\omega)$ *and the connection* A *give rise to an almost complex structure* J_A *on* $P(M)$ *that is tamed by the symplectic form* ω_{A_0}*.*
- (ii) *The almost complex structures* J_A *and* J_{A_0} *satisfy*

$$\big\|J_A-J_{A_0}\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)}\le c'\cdot\big\|A-A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)}.$$

Denote by $\tilde u\colon\Sigma\to P(M)$ *the section of* $P(M)$ *that is induced by the* G*-equivariant map* $u\colon P\to M$ *(see Remark 1.4).*

- (iii) *The curve* $\tilde u\colon\Sigma\to P(M)$ *is* (j_Σ,J_A)*-holomorphic.*

Denote by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{J_A}:=\omega_{A_0}(\cdot\,,J_A\cdot)$ *the Riemannian metric on* $P(M)$ *determined by the symplectic form* ω_A *and the almost complex structure* J_A*, and recall that the energy of the curve* $\tilde u\colon\Sigma\to P(M)$ *is given by*

$$E_{J_A}(\tilde u)=\frac12\int_\Sigma|\mathrm{d}\tilde u|^2_{J_A}\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma,$$

where the operator norm $|\mathrm{d}\tilde u|_{J_A}$ *is understood with respect to the metric* $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{J_A}$ *on* $P(M)$ *and the Kähler metric on* Σ *determined by* dvol_Σ *and* j_Σ*.*

- (iv) *The energy of the curve* $\tilde u\colon\Sigma\to P(M)$ *and the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of the vortex* (A,u) *are related by*

$$E_{J_A}(\tilde u)\le c''\cdot\Big(E_J(A,u)+\mathrm{Vol}(\Sigma)\Big).$$

- (v) *For all* $z_0\in\Sigma$ *and all* $0<r<r_0$*, the curve* $\tilde u\colon\Sigma\to P(M)$ *satisfies a mean value inequality of the form*

$$E_{J_A}\big(\tilde u;B_r(z_0)\big)<\delta\qquad\Longrightarrow\qquad\big|\mathrm{d}\tilde u(z_0)\big|^2_{J_A}\le\frac{C}{r^2}\cdot E_{J_A}\big(\tilde u;B_r(z_0)\big)+C.$$

The proof of Proposition 5.1 will occupy the remainder of this subsection.

We begin with a general review of symplectic forms and almost complex structures on the fiber bundle $P(M)$. Our exposition follows the work of Mundet i Riera [18], Mundet i Riera and Tian [19], Cieliebak, Gaio, and Salamon [2] and González, Woodward, and Ziltener [5].

For now assume that $A \in \mathcal{A}(P)$ is an arbitrary smooth connection on P. Fix a complex structure j_Σ and an area form dvol_Σ on Σ. We denote the points of $P(M) = (P \times M)/G$ as equivalence classes $[p,x]$, where $p \in P$ and $x \in M$. The tangent space $T_{[p,x]}P(M)$ of $P(M)$ at any such point is then given by

$$T_{[p,x]}P(M) = \big(T_pP \times T_xM\big)\big/\big\{(p\xi, -X_\xi(x)) \,|\, \xi \in \mathfrak{g}\big\},$$

where $p\xi \in T_pP$ denotes the infinitesimal action of ξ on the total space P at the point p. The elements of this tangent space will be denoted as equivalence classes $[v,w]$, where $v \in T_pP$ and $w \in T_xM$. The connection A gives rise to a splitting

$$TP \cong TP^{\mathrm{hor}} \oplus TP^{\mathrm{vert}}$$

of the tangent bundle of P into horizontal and vertical subbundles. This splitting further induces a splitting

$$TP(M) \cong TP(M)^{\mathrm{hor}} \oplus TP(M)^{\mathrm{vert}} \tag{5.1}$$

of the tangent bundle of $P(M)$ in the following way. The horizontal subbundle is the image of TP^{hor} in $TP(M)$ and is given by

$$TP(M)^{\mathrm{hor}} = \big(TP^{\mathrm{hor}} \times M\big)/G \cong p^*T\Sigma,$$

where $p\colon P(M) \to \Sigma$ denotes the bundle projection. The vertical subbundle is the kernel of the differential $\mathrm{d}p\colon TP(M) \to T\Sigma$ and is given by

$$TP(M)^{\mathrm{vert}} = \big(P \times TM\big)/G.$$

The decomposition of any tangent vector $[v,w] \in T_{[p,x]}P(M)$ corresponding to (5.1) is then given by

$$[v,w] = \big[v^{\mathrm{hor}} + pA_p(v), w\big] = \big[v^{\mathrm{hor}}, w + X_{A_p(v)}(x)\big]. \tag{5.2}$$

We now explain how the connection A induces a symplectic form on the total space $P(M)$. First we review from Guillemin and Sternberg [9], Section 9.5, the construction of the coupling form on $P(M)$. Denote by $p_1\colon P \times M \to P$ and $p_2\colon P \times M \to M$ the canonical projections, and consider the 2-form

$$\widetilde{\sigma}_A := p_2^*\,\omega - \mathrm{d}\big\langle p_1^*A, \mu \circ p_2\big\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} \in \Omega^2(P \times M)$$

on the product $P \times M$. It is closed because ω is closed, and G-invariant since ω is G-invariant and A and μ are G-equivariant. To simplify notation, we will henceforth drop the projections p_1 and p_2 and simply write

$$\widetilde{\sigma}_A = \omega - \mathrm{d}\langle A, \mu\rangle.$$

We prove that $\widetilde{\sigma}_A$ vanishes along the orbits of the G-action on $P \times M$ and thus descends to a closed 2-form

$$\sigma_A \in \Omega^2(P(M))$$

on $P(M)$, which is called the coupling form in [9]. To this end we compute

$$\widetilde{\sigma}_A = \omega - \big\langle \mathrm{d}A, \mu \big\rangle + \big\langle A \wedge \mathrm{d}\mu \big\rangle.$$

For later reference we spell out this formula in more explicit terms. Let $(p, x) \in P \times M$ and $(v_1, w_1), (v_2, w_2) \in T_pP \times T_xM$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\sigma}_A\big((v_1, w_1), (v_2, w_2)\big) = \omega(w_1, w_2) - \big\langle F_A(v_1, v_2) - [A(v_1), A(v_2)], \mu \big\rangle \\ + \big\langle A(v_1), \mathrm{d}\mu(w_2)\big\rangle - \big\langle A(v_2), \mathrm{d}\mu(w_1)\big\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Assume now that $(v_1, w_1) = (p\xi, -X_\xi(x))$ is the infinitesimal action of $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$ on (p, x). Using the relations

$$\omega_x\big(X_\xi(x), w\big) = \big\langle \mathrm{d}_x\mu(w), \xi \big\rangle, \quad \mathrm{d}_x\mu\big(X_\xi(x)\big) = [\xi, \mu(x)], \quad \big\langle [\xi_1, \xi_2], \xi_3 \big\rangle = \big\langle \xi_1, [\xi_2, \xi_3] \big\rangle,$$

where $\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3 \in \mathfrak{g}$, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \widetilde{\sigma}_A\big((p\xi, -X_\xi(x)), (v, w)\big) \\ = \; & -\omega_x\big(X_\xi(x), w\big) - \big\langle (F_A)_p(p\xi, v) - [A_p(p\xi), A_p(v)], \mu(x) \big\rangle + \big\langle A_p(p\xi), \mathrm{d}_x\mu(w) \big\rangle \\ & \quad + \big\langle A_p(v), \mathrm{d}_x\mu(X_\xi(x)) \big\rangle \\ = \; & -\big\langle \mathrm{d}_x\mu(w), \xi \big\rangle + \big\langle [A_p(p\xi), A_p(v)], \mu(x) \big\rangle + \big\langle \xi, \mathrm{d}_x\mu(w) \big\rangle + \big\langle A_p(v), \mathrm{d}_x\mu(X_\xi(x)) \big\rangle \\ = \; & \big\langle [\xi, A_p(v)], \mu(x) \big\rangle + \big\langle A_p(v), [\xi, \mu(x)] \big\rangle \\ = \; & -\big\langle A_p(v), [\xi, \mu(x)] \big\rangle + \big\langle A_p(v), [\xi, \mu(x)] \big\rangle = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we used that F_A is horizontal. Thus $\widetilde{\sigma}_A$ in fact vanishes along the G-orbits, so the coupling form σ_A is well-defined. As a by-product of this calculation we obtain from (5.3) an explicit formula for the coupling form. That is, for tangent vectors $[v_1, w_1], [v_2, w_2] \in TP(M)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_A\big([v_1, w_1], [v_2, w_2]\big) \\ = \; & \sigma_A\Big(\big[v_1^{\mathrm{hor}}, w_1 + X_{A(v_1)}\big], \big[v_2^{\mathrm{hor}}, w_2 + X_{A(v_2)}\big]\Big) \\ = \; & \omega\big(w_1 + X_{A(v_1)}, w_2 + X_{A(v_2)}\big) - \big\langle F_A\big(v_1^{\mathrm{hor}}, v_2^{\mathrm{hor}}\big), \mu \big\rangle \\ & \quad + \big\langle \big[A\big(v_1^{\mathrm{hor}}\big), A\big(v_2^{\mathrm{hor}}\big)\big], \mu \big\rangle + \big\langle A\big(v_1^{\mathrm{hor}}\big), \mathrm{d}\mu\big(w_2 + X_{A(v_2)}\big) \big\rangle \\ & \quad - \big\langle A\big(v_2^{\mathrm{hor}}\big), \mathrm{d}\mu\big(w_1 + X_{A(v_2)}\big) \big\rangle \\ = \; & \omega\big(w_1 + X_{A(v_1)}, w_2 + X_{A(v_2)}\big) - \big\langle F_A\big(v_1, v_2\big), \mu \big\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

since A vanishes on horizontal tangent vectors and F_A is horizontal. In particular, we see from this formula that the coupling form σ_A may be degenerate in the horizontal direction. In order to make it into a symplectic form on $P(M)$ we therefore have to add on a sufficiently large multiple of the pull-back of the area form dvol_Σ along the bundle projection $p\colon P(M) \to \Sigma$. This leads us to define the symplectic form on $P(M)$ by

$$\omega_A := (1 + c_{A,\mu}) \cdot p^*\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma + \sigma_A \in \Omega^2(P(M)), \tag{5.5}$$

where $c_{A,\mu} > 0$ is a sufficiently large constant defined by the relation

$$|\langle F_A(v_1, v_2), \mu\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}| \leq c_{A,\mu} \cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v_1)| \cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v_2)| \tag{5.6}$$

for $v_1, v_2 \in TP$. Note that such constant exists because the curvature F_A is horizontal.

Lemma 5.2. *The form ω_A is a symplectic form on $P(M)$.*

Proof. It follows from the defining relation (5.5) that ω_A is closed since both dvol_Σ and the coupling form σ_A are closed. To check that ω_A is non-degenerate, let $[v_1, w_1] \in T_{[p,x]}P(M)$ and suppose that

$$\omega_A\big([v_1, w_1], [v_2, w_2]\big) = 0 \tag{5.7}$$

for all $[v_2, w_2] \in T_{[p,x]}P(M)$.

Assume first that $v_2 = 0$. Plugging the explicit Formula (5.4) into (5.5) we obtain

$$\omega\big(w_1 + X_{A(v_1)}(x), w_2\big) = \omega_A\big([v_1, w_1], [v_2, w_2]\big) = 0$$

for all $w_2 \in T_xM$. Since ω is non-degenerate this implies that

$$w_1 + X_{A(v_1)}(x) = 0. \tag{5.8}$$

Now assume that $v_2 = (\pi^* j_\Sigma)v_1$ is the horizontal lift of $j_\Sigma\,\mathrm{d}_p\pi(v_1)$ to T_pP, and that $w_2 = 0$. Plugging (5.4) into (5.5) and using (5.8) and Estimate (5.6) we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= -\big\langle F_A(v_1, v_2), \mu(x)\big\rangle + (1 + c_{A,\mu}) \cdot p^*\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma(v_1, v_2) \\ &\geq -\, c_{A,\mu} \cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v_1)| \cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v_2)| + (1 + c_{A,\mu}) \cdot \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\big(\mathrm{d}\pi(v_1), \mathrm{d}\pi(v_2)\big) \\ &= -\, c_{A,\mu} \cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v_1)| \cdot |j_\Sigma\,\mathrm{d}\pi(v_1)| + (1 + c_{A,\mu}) \cdot \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\big(\mathrm{d}\pi(v_1), j_\Sigma\,\mathrm{d}\pi(v_1)\big) \\ &= |\mathrm{d}\pi(v_1)|^2 . \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\mathrm{d}\pi(v_1) = 0$, whence $v_1^{\mathrm{hor}} = 0$. Combining this with (5.8), we thus obtain

$$[v_1, w_1] = \big[v_1^{\mathrm{hor}}, w_1 + X_{A(v_1)}(x)\big] = 0.$$

□

Next we fix a smooth family $J\colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M. We may then use the splitting (5.1)

$$TP(M) \cong TP(M)^{\mathrm{hor}} \oplus TP(M)^{\mathrm{vert}}$$

induced by A to define an almost complex structure on $P(M)$ in terms of the complex structure j_Σ and the family $J\colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ as follows. First, we define an almost complex structure on the horizontal subbundle $TP(M)^{\mathrm{hor}}$. To this end we fix an identification $TP^{\mathrm{hor}} \cong \pi^*T\Sigma$. The complex structure j_Σ then pulls back to a G-equivariant complex structure

$$\pi^* j_\Sigma \colon TP^{\mathrm{hor}} \longrightarrow TP^{\mathrm{hor}}$$

on the horizontal subbundle. This complex structure then induces a complex structure j_P on the horizontal subbundle $TP(M)^{\mathrm{hor}} = (TP^{\mathrm{hor}} \times M)/G$ which in explicit terms is given by the formula

$$j_P[v^{\mathrm{hor}}, 0] = \big[(\pi^* j_\Sigma) v^{\mathrm{hor}}, 0\big]$$

for $v^{\mathrm{hor}} \in TP^{\mathrm{hor}}$. Second, in order to define a complex structure on the vertical subbundle $TP(M)^{\mathrm{vert}}$ we note that the family $J \colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M, \omega)$ induces a G-equivariant map

$$P \times TM \longrightarrow P \times TM, \qquad (p, w) \mapsto \big(p, J_{\pi(p)} w\big).$$

This map descends to a complex structure J_M on the vertical subbundle $TP(M)^{\mathrm{vert}} = (P \times TM)/G$, which in explicit terms is given by the formula

$$J_M[0, w] = \big[0, J_{\pi(p)} w\big]$$

for $p \in P$ and $w \in TM$. We then define an almost complex structure on $P(M)$ by

$$J_A := j_P \oplus J_M \colon TP(M) \longrightarrow TP(M),$$

where the direct sum is to be understood with respect to the splitting (5.1). For later reference we note that it is given explicitly by the formula

$$J_A[v, w] = \Big[(\pi^* j_\Sigma)_p v^{\mathrm{hor}}, J_{\pi(p)}\big(w + X_{A_p(v)}(x)\big)\Big] \tag{5.9}$$

for $[p, x] \in P(M)$ and $[v, w] \in T_{[p,x]}P(M)$. This follows directly from (5.2).

Lemma 5.3. *The map J_A is an almost complex structure on $P(M)$.*

Proof. This is immediate from the definition of J_A since j_P and J_M are almost complex structures on the subbundles $TP(M)^{\mathrm{hor}}$ and $TP(M)^{\mathrm{vert}}$, respectively. □

We now begin with the actual proof of Proposition 5.1. Let us fix a smooth reference connection $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}(P)$ on P. By Lemma 5.2 above, A_0 induces a symplectic form ω_{A_0} on $P(M)$.

Assertion (i) of Proposition 5.1 is a consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *Fix a smooth reference connection $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}(P)$. There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the following holds. For every smooth connection $A \in \mathcal{A}(P)$ satisfying*

$$\big\| A - A_0 \big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)} \leq c$$

the almost complex structure J_A is tamed by the symplectic form ω_{A_0}.

Proof. Suppose that $[v,w] \in TP(M)$ such that $[v,w] \neq 0$. We have to prove that

$$\omega_{A_0}\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big) > 0.$$

By Formula (5.2) we may without loss of generality assume that v is A-horizontal. Then (5.9) yields

$$J_A[v,w] = \big[(\pi^* j_\Sigma)v, Jw\big].$$

Plugging (5.4) into (5.5), we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \omega_{A_0}\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big) \\
= \;& \sigma_{A_0}\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big) + (1 + c_{A_0,\mu}) \cdot p^*\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big) \\
= \;& \sigma_{A_0}\Big([v,w], \big[(\pi^* j_\Sigma)v, Jw\big]\Big) \\
& \qquad + (1 + c_{A_0,\mu}) \cdot p^*\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\Big([v,w], \big[(\pi^* j_\Sigma)v, Jw\big]\Big) \\
= \;& \omega\big(w + X_{A_0(v)}, Jw + X_{A_0((\pi^* j_\Sigma)v)}\big) \\
& \quad - \big\langle F_{A_0}\big(v, (\pi^* j_\Sigma)v\big), \mu\big\rangle + (1 + c_{A_0,\mu}) \cdot \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\big(\mathrm{d}\pi(v), j_\Sigma \,\mathrm{d}\pi(v)\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

The last two terms on the right-hand side of this equation may be estimated using Inequality (5.6) by

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\big\langle F_{A_0}\big(v, (\pi^* j_\Sigma)v\big), \mu\big\rangle + (1 + c_{A_0,\mu}) \cdot \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\big(\mathrm{d}\pi(v), j_\Sigma \,\mathrm{d}\pi(v)\big) \\
\geq \;& -c_{A_0,\mu} \cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)| \cdot |j_\Sigma \,\mathrm{d}\pi(v)| + (1 + c_{A_0,\mu}) \cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2 \\
\geq \;& |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2 .
\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

In order to estimate the first term in (5.10), we express it in the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega\big(w + X_{A_0(v)}, Jw + X_{A_0((\pi^* j_\Sigma)v)}\big) &= \omega\big(w, Jw\big) + \omega\big(X_{(A-A_0(\mathrm{d}\pi(v))}, Jw\big) \\
&\quad + \omega\big(w, X_{(A-A_0)(j_\Sigma \,\mathrm{d}\pi(v))}\big) + \omega\big(X_{(A-A_0)(\mathrm{d}\pi(v))}, X_{(A-A_0)(j_\Sigma \,\mathrm{d}\pi(v))}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used that $A - A_0$ is horizontal and that $A(v) = 0$ since v is A-horizontal by assumption. Now there exists a constant $\tilde{c} > 1$, not depending on A, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\omega\big(X_{(A-A_0)(\mathrm{d}\pi(v))}, Jw\big)\big| &\leq 2\tilde{c}\; |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)| \cdot |w|_J \cdot \big\|A - A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)}, \\
\big|\omega\big(w, X_{(A-A_0)(j_\Sigma \,\mathrm{d}\pi(v))}\big)\big| &\leq 2\tilde{c}\; |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)| \cdot |w|_J \cdot \big\|A - A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)}, \\
\big|\omega\big(X_{(A-A_0)(\mathrm{d}\pi(v))}, X_{(A-A_0)(j_\Sigma \,\mathrm{d}\pi(v))}\big)\big| &\leq 2\tilde{c}\; |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)| \cdot |j_\Sigma \,\mathrm{d}\pi(v)| \cdot \big\|A - A_0\big\|^2_{C^0(\Sigma)} \\
&= 2\tilde{c}\; |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2 \cdot \big\|A - A_0\big\|^2_{C^0(\Sigma)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain an estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \big|\omega\big(w + X_{A_0(v)}, Jw + X_{A_0((\pi^* j_\Sigma)v)}\big)\big| \\
\geq \;& |w|_J^2 - 4c\; |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)| \cdot |w|_J \cdot \big\|A - A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)} - 2\tilde{c}\; |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2 \cdot \big\|A - A_0\big\|^2_{C^0(\Sigma)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \; |w|_J^2 - 18\tilde{c}^2 \,|\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2 \cdot \big\|A - A_0\big\|^2_{C^0(\Sigma)} - \frac{2}{3}\,|w|^2 - 2\tilde{c}\,|\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2 \cdot \big\|A - A_0\big\|^2_{C^0(\Sigma)} \\ &= \; \frac{1}{3}\,|w|_J^2 - 20\,\tilde{c}\,(\tilde{c}-1) \cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2 \cdot \big\|A - A_0\big\|^2_{C^0(\Sigma)}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (5.11) it follows from (5.10) that

$$\omega_{A_0}\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big) \geq \frac{1}{3}\,|w|_J^2 + |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2 \cdot \Big(1 - 20\,\tilde{c}\,(\tilde{c}-1) \cdot \big\|A - A_0\big\|^2_{C^0(\Sigma)}\Big).$$

Setting $c := 1/\sqrt{30\,\tilde{c}\,(\tilde{c}-1)} > 0$ we get

$$\omega_{A_0}\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big) \geq \frac{1}{3}\,\Big(|w|_J^2 + |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2\Big) > 0$$

whenever

$$\big\|A - A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)} \leq c.$$

Note that the constant c does not depend on A. □

Next we observe that Assertion (ii) of Proposition 5.1 is an immediate consequence of the definition of the almost complex structure J_A in (5.9) above.

Assertion (iii) is the content of the following result.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $A \in \mathcal{A}(P)$ be a smooth connection on P. Let $u\colon P \to M$ be a smooth G-equivariant map with associated section $\tilde{u}\colon \Sigma \to P(M)$. If the pair (A,u) satisfies the first vortex equation*

$$\overline{\partial}_{J,A}(u) = \frac{1}{2}\,\big(\mathrm{d}_A u + J(u) \circ \mathrm{d}_A u \circ j_\Sigma\big) = 0,$$

then

$$\overline{\partial}_{J_A}(\tilde{u}) = \frac{1}{2}\,\big(\mathrm{d}\tilde{u} + J_A(\tilde{u}) \circ \mathrm{d}\tilde{u} \circ j_\Sigma\big) = 0,$$

that is, $\tilde{u}$ is a (j_Σ, J_A)-holomorphic curve.

Proof. First, we express the derivative of the curve $\tilde{u}$ in terms of the derivative of the map u. For $z \in \Sigma$ and $v \in T_z\Sigma$ we have

$$\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(z)(v) = \big[\tilde{v}, \mathrm{d}u(p)(\tilde{v})\big] = \big[\tilde{v}, \mathrm{d}_A u(z)(\tilde{v})\big]$$

for $p \in P$ such that $\pi(p) = z$, where $\tilde{v} \in T_pP$ denotes the A-horizontal lift of v. Since (A,u) satisfies the first vortex equation,

$$J\;\mathrm{d}_A u(\tilde{v}) = \mathrm{d}_A u\big((\pi^* j_\Sigma)\tilde{v}\big).$$

Using Formula (5.9) we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_A\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(v) &= J_A\,[\tilde{v}, \mathrm{d}_A u(\tilde{v})] \\ &= \big[(\pi^* j_\Sigma)\tilde{v}, J\,\mathrm{d}_A u(\tilde{v})\big] \\ &= \big[(\pi^* j_\Sigma)\tilde{v}, \mathrm{d}_A u\big((\pi^* j_\Sigma)\tilde{v}\big)\big] = \mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big(j_\Sigma\,v\big). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\overline{\partial}_{J_A}(\tilde{u}) = \frac{1}{2}\big(\mathrm{d}\tilde{u} + J_A(\tilde{u}) \circ \mathrm{d}\tilde{u} \circ j_\Sigma\big) = 0,$$

which proves the lemma.

□

Now we come to the proof of Assertions (iv) and (v). Let $A \in \mathcal{A}(P)$ be a smooth connection and assume that it satisfies $\|A - A_0\|_{C^0(\Sigma)} \le c$, where c is the constant of Lemma 5.4 above. By Lemma 5.4 the symplectic form ω_{A_0} tames the almost complex structure J_A. We shall denote by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{J_A}$ the Riemannian metric on $P(M)$ determined by ω_{A_0} and J_A. It is given by

$$\big\langle [v_1,w_1],[v_2,w_2]\big\rangle_{J_A} := \frac{1}{2}\Big(\omega_{A_0}\big([v_1,w_1], J_A[v_2,w_2]\big) + \omega_{A_0}\big([v_2,w_2], J_A[v_1,w_1]\big)\Big)$$

for $[v_1,w_1],[v_2,w_2] \in TP(M)$. The norm associated to this metric is then given by

$$\big|[v,w]\big|_{J_A}^2 = \omega_{A_0}\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big)$$

for $[v,w] \in TP(M)$. The next lemma relates this norm with the metric on Σ determined by dvol_Σ and j_Σ and the metric on M determined by ω and J.

Lemma 5.6. *Fix a smooth reference connection $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}(P)$. There exist constants $c > 0$ and $C_{A_0} > 0$ such that for all smooth connections $A \in \mathcal{A}(P)$ satisfying*

$$\big\|A - A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)} \le c$$

the following holds. The Riemannian metric $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{J_A}$ on $P(M)$ determined by ω_{A_0} and J_A satisfies the relation

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(|\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2 + |w|_J^2\right) \le \big|[v,w]\big|_{J_A}^2 \le C_{A_0} \cdot \left(|\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2 + |w|_J^2\right)$$

for all $[v,w] \in TP(M)$ such that v is A-horizontal, where $\pi\colon P \to \Sigma$ denotes the bundle projection.

Proof. Let $[v,w] \in TP(M)$ such that $A(v) = 0$. By (5.9) we have

$$J_A[v,w] = \big[(\pi^* j_\Sigma)v, Jw\big].$$

Plugging (5.4) into (5.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \omega_{A_0}\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big) \\
= \;& \omega_{A_0}\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big) + (1 + c_{A_0,\mu}) \cdot p^*\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big) \\
= \;& \omega_{A_0}\big([v,w], \big[(\pi^* j_\Sigma)v, Jw\big]\big) + (1 + c_{A_0,\mu}) \cdot p^*\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\big([v,w], \big[(\pi^* j_\Sigma)v, Jw\big]\big) \\
= \;& \omega\big(w + X_{A_0(v)}, Jw + X_{A_0((\pi^* j_\Sigma)v)}\big) \\
& \qquad - \big\langle F_{A_0}\big(v, (\pi^* j_\Sigma)v\big), \mu\big\rangle + (1 + c_{A_0,\mu}) \cdot \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\big(\mathrm{d}\pi(v), j_\Sigma\,\mathrm{d}\pi(v)\big) \\
= \;& \omega(w, Jw) + \omega\big(X_{A_0(v)}, Jw\big) + \omega\big(w, X_{A_0((\pi^* j_\Sigma)v)}\big) + \omega\big(X_{A_0(v)}, X_{A_0((\pi^* j_\Sigma)v)}\big)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\quad - \big\langle F_{A_0}\big(v,(\pi^* j_\Sigma)v\big),\mu\big\rangle + (1+c_{A_0,\mu})\cdot \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\big(\mathrm{d}\pi(v), j_\Sigma\,\mathrm{d}\pi(v)\big)\\
=\ & |w|_J^2 + \omega\big(X_{A_0(v)}, Jw\big) + \omega\big(w, X_{A_0((\pi^* j_\Sigma)v)}\big) + \omega\big(X_{A_0(v)}, X_{A_0((\pi^* j_\Sigma)v)}\big)\\
&\quad - \big\langle F_{A_0}\big(v,(\pi^* j_\Sigma)v\big),\mu\big\rangle + (1+c_{A_0,\mu})\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2 \qquad (5.12)
\end{aligned}
$$

Then by Inequality (5.6),

$$
\big|\big\langle F_{A_0}\big(v,(\pi^* j_\Sigma)v\big),\mu\big\rangle\big| \le c_{A_0,\mu}\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|\cdot |j_\Sigma\,\mathrm{d}\pi(v)| = c_{A_0,\mu}\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2 .
$$

Moreover, there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\big|\omega\big(X_{(A-A_0)(v)}, Jw\big)\big| &\le c_1\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|\cdot |w|_J\cdot \big\|A-A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)},\\
\big|\omega\big(w, X_{(A-A_0)(j_\Sigma\,\mathrm{d}\pi(v))}\big)\big| &\le c_1\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|\cdot |w|_J\cdot \big\|A-A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)},\\
\big|\omega\big(X_{(A-A_0)(\mathrm{d}\pi(v))}, X_{(A-A_0)(j_\Sigma\,\mathrm{d}\pi(v))}\big)\big| &\le c_1^2\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2\cdot \big\|A-A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)}^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Plugging this into (5.12) and using Young's inequality we obtain estimates

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{A_0}\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big)\\
&\ge |w|_J^2 - 2\,c_1\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|\cdot |w|_J\cdot \big\|A-A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)} - c_1^2\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2\cdot \big\|A-A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)}^2 + |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2\\
&\ge \frac{1}{2}\,|w|_J^2 + \Big(1 - \big(2\,c_1^2 - 1\big)\cdot \big\|A-A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)}^2\Big)\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{A_0}\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big)\\
&\le |w|_J^2 + 2\,c_1\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|\cdot |w|_J\cdot \big\|A-A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)} + c_1^2\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2\cdot \big\|A-A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)}^2\\
&\quad + 2\,c_{A_0,\mu}\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2\\
&\le 2\,|w|_J^2 + \Big(1 + 2\,c_{A_0,\mu} + \big(c_1^2+1\big)\cdot \big\|A-A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)}^2\Big)\cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Whence there exists a constant $C_{A_0} > 0$ such that

$$
\omega_{A_0}\big([v,w], J_{A_0}[v,w]\big) \ge \frac{1}{2}\cdot \big(|w|_J^2 + |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2\big)
$$

and

$$
\omega_{A_0}\big([v,w], J_A[v,w]\big) \le C_{A_0}\cdot \big(|w|^2 + |\mathrm{d}\pi(v)|^2\big)
$$

whenever $\|A - A_0\|_{C^0(\Sigma)}$ is sufficiently small. Thus, taking c to be the constant of Lemma 5.4 and shrinking it if necessary, the lemma follows. □

We are now ready to finish the proof of Assertions (iv) and (v) of Proposition 5.1.

Lemma 5.7. *Fix a smooth reference connection $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}(P)$, and let C_{A_0} be the constant of Lemma 5.6. There exist constants $r_0 > 0$ and $\delta, C > 0$ such that for all vortices (A,u) satisfying*

$$
\big\|A - A_0\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma)} \le c,
$$

where c is the constant of Lemma 5.6, the following holds.

(i) *The energy of the curve* $\tilde{u}\colon \Sigma \to P(M)$ *and the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of the vortex* (A, u) *are related by*

$$E_{J_A}(\tilde{u}) \leq C_{A_0} \cdot \big(E_J(A,u) + \mathrm{Vol}(\Sigma)\big).$$

(ii) *For all* $z_0 \in \Sigma$ *and all* $0 < r < r_0$*, the curve* $\tilde{u}\colon \Sigma \to P(M)$ *satisfies a mean value inequality of the form*

$$E_{J_A}\big(\tilde{u}; B_r(z_0)\big) < \delta \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \big|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(z_0)\big|_{J_A}^2 \leq \frac{C}{r^2} \cdot E_{J_A}\big(\tilde{u}; B_r(z_0)\big) + C.$$

Proof. We first compare the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of the vortex (A, u) with the energy of the curve $\tilde{u}\colon \Sigma \to P(M)$. For $z \in \Sigma$ and $v \in T_z\Sigma$ we have

$$\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(z)(v) = \big[\tilde{v}, \mathrm{d}u(p)(\tilde{v})\big] = \big[\tilde{v}, \mathrm{d}_A u(z)(\tilde{v})\big] \tag{5.13}$$

for all $p \in P$ such that $\pi(p) = z$, where $\tilde{v} \in T_pP$ denotes the A-horizontal lift of v. By Lemma 5.6 and Formula (5.13) we have an inequality

$$\frac{1}{2}\Big(|v|^2 + |\mathrm{d}_A u(v)|_J^2\Big) \leq \big|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(v)\big|_{J_A}^2 \leq C_{A_0} \cdot \Big(|v|^2 + |\mathrm{d}_A u(v)|_J^2\Big)$$

for all $v \in T\Sigma$, where C_{A_0} is the constant of Lemma 5.6. Rewriting this in terms of operator norms we therefore get an estimate

$$\frac{1}{2}\Big(1 + |\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2\Big) \leq \big|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}\big|_{J_A}^2 \leq C_{A_0} \cdot \Big(1 + |\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2\Big). \tag{5.14}$$

Before we go on, let us briefly recall from Section 1 the definition of the energy and Yang-Mills-Higgs energy. For an open subset $U \subset \Sigma$, the energy of the curve $\tilde{u}$ on U is given by

$$E_{J_A}(\tilde{u}; U) = \frac{1}{2}\int_U |\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}|_{J_A}^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma,$$

and the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of the vortex (A, u) on U is given by

$$E_J(A, u; U) = \frac{1}{2}\int_U \left(\frac{1}{2}|\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2 + |\mu(u)|^2\right) \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\,.$$

To prove part (i), we use Inequality (5.14) to estimate the energy of the curve $\tilde{u}$ in terms of the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of the vortex (A, u) by

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{J_A}(\tilde{u}) &= \frac{1}{2}\int_\Sigma |\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}|_{J_A}^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma \\
&\leq \frac{C_{A_0}}{2} \cdot \int_\Sigma \Big(1 + |\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2\Big) \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma \\
&= C_{A_0} \cdot \int_\Sigma \left(\frac{1}{2}|\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2 + |\mu(u)|^2\right) \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma \\
&\qquad\qquad - \frac{C_{A_0}}{2} \cdot \int_\Sigma \Big(2\,|\mu(u)|^2 - 1\Big) \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\le C_{A_0}\cdot E_J(A,u)+C_{A_0}\cdot\int_\Sigma \mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\\
&= C_{A_0}\cdot\Big(E_J(A,u)+\mathrm{Vol}(\Sigma)\Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

This proves (i).

To prove Assertion (ii) we now fix $z_0\in\Sigma$. By Corollary 2.2 there exist constants $\hbar>0$, $C'>0$ and $R>0$ such that for all $0<r<R$ the vortex (A,u) satisfies the a priori estimate

$$
E\big(A,u;B_r(z_0)\big)<\hbar \quad\Longrightarrow\quad \frac{1}{2}\big|\mathrm{d}_A u(z_0)\big|_J^2+\big|\mu(u(z_0))\big|^2\le\frac{C'}{r^2}\cdot E\big(A,u;B_r(z_0)\big). \tag{5.15}
$$

We set

$$
K:=\|\mu\|^2_{C^0(M)}\ge 0.
$$

Note that K is finite by compactness of M. We then define the constants δ and C by

$$
\delta:=\frac{\hbar}{4}>0\quad\text{and}\quad C:=4\,C_{A_0}\cdot(1+C')\cdot\left(1+K\cdot\sup_{0<r<R}\frac{\mathrm{Vol}(B_r(z_0))}{r^2}\right),
$$

where C_{A_0} is the constant of Lemma 5.6. Recall that $B_r(z_0)$ denotes the closed geodesic disc in Σ around z_0 of radius r, understood with respect to the metric determined by the area for dvol_Σ and the complex structure j_Σ. Further, fix a constant $0<r_0<R$ such that

$$
\mathrm{Vol}\big(B_r(z_0)\big)\le\frac{\hbar}{2K}
$$

for all $0<r<r_0$.

Assume now that $r<r_0$ and

$$
E_{J_A}\big(\tilde{u};B_r(z_0)\big)<\delta. \tag{5.16}
$$

We then obtain from (5.14) the inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_{J_A}\big(\tilde{u};B_r(z_0)\big) &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{B_r(z_0)}|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}|^2_{J_A}\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\\
&\ge \frac{1}{4}\int_{B_r(z_0)}\Big(1+|\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2\Big)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\\
&= \frac{1}{2}\int_{B_r(z_0)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\,|\mathrm{d}_A u|_J^2+|\mu(u)|^2\right)\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\\
&\qquad\qquad -\frac{1}{4}\int_{B_r(z_0)}\Big(2\,|\mu(u)|^2-1\Big)\,\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma\\
&\ge \frac{1}{2}\,E_J\big(A,u;B_r(z_0)\big)-\frac{1}{2}\,K\cdot\mathrm{Vol}\big(B_r(z_0)\big).
\end{aligned}
$$

We have thus proved that

$$
E_J\big(A,u;B_r(z_0)\big)\le 2\,E_{J_A}\big(\tilde{u};B_r(z_0)\big)+K\cdot\mathrm{Vol}\big(B_r(z_0)\big). \tag{5.17}
$$

Hence by (5.16),

$$E_J\big(A, u; B_r(z_0)\big) < \frac{\hbar}{2} + K \cdot \mathrm{Vol}\big(B_r(z_0)\big).$$

Since $r < r_0$ it follows from the definition of r_0 and the last inequality that

$$E_J\big(A, u; B_r(z_0)\big) < \hbar,$$

so the a priori estimate (5.15) implies

$$\frac{1}{2}\big|\mathrm{d}_A u(z_0)\big|_J^2 + \big|\mu(u(z_0))\big|^2 \leq \frac{C'}{r^2} \cdot E_J\big(A, u; B_r(z_0)\big). \tag{5.18}$$

Combining this with the second inequality in (5.14) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(z_0)\big|_{J_A}^2 &\leq C_{A_0} \cdot \Big(1 + \big|\mathrm{d}_A u(z_0)\big|_J^2\Big) \\ &\leq 2\,C_{A_0} \cdot \bigg(\frac{1}{2}\big|\mathrm{d}_A u(z_0)\big|_J^2 + \big|\mu(u(z_0))\big|^2\bigg) + C_{A_0} \\ &\leq \frac{2\,C'\,C_{A_0}}{r^2} \cdot E_J\big(A, u; B_r(z_0)\big) + C_{A_0}.\end{aligned}$$

Once again applying Inequality (5.17) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\mathrm{d}\tilde{u}(z_0)\big|_{J_A}^2 &\leq \frac{4\,C'\,C_{A_0}}{r^2} \cdot E_{J_A}\big(\tilde{u}; B_r(z_0)\big) + 2\,C_{A_0} \cdot \bigg(C' \cdot K \cdot \frac{\mathrm{Vol}(B_r(z_0))}{r^2} + 1\bigg) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{r^2} \cdot E_{J_A}\big(\tilde{u}; B_r(z_0)\big) + C.\end{aligned}$$

This proves (ii). □

We have now completed the proof of Proposition 5.1.

5.2. **Bubbles connect revisited.** The aim of this subsection is to prove Proposition 5.8, which collects some preliminary results that will be needed to carry out the bubbling analysis in the construction of the limit polystable vortex in the proof of Theorem 1.8 in Section 5.3. Basically, what we do in Proposition 5.8 is tailor Propositions 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 in [16] to our situation, the main difference being that we assume convergence of the almost complex structures only in the C^0-topology.

Throughout this subsection, let (M, ω) be an arbitrary compact symplectic manifold. Moreover, for $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $r > 0$

$$B_r(z_0) := \big\{ z \in \mathbb{C} \,\big|\, |z - z_0| \leq r \big\}$$

denotes the closed disc of radius r around z_0. We shall denote by $\mathcal{J}_\tau^0(M, \omega)$ the space of ω-tame almost complex structures on M of class C^0. Given an ω-tame almost complex structure $I \in \mathcal{J}_\tau^0(M, \omega)$, we denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_I$ the corresponding Riemannian metric on M

determined by I and ω. Recall that the energy of an I-holomorphic curve $u\colon B_r(z_0) \to M$ is then given by

$$E_I\big(u, B_r(z_0)\big) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_r(z_0)} |\mathrm{d}u|_I^2 \,,$$

see [16], Section 2.2.

Proposition 5.8. *Let (M, ω) be a compact symplectic manifold. Let $I \in \mathcal{J}_\tau^0(M, \omega)$ be an ω-tame almost complex structure on M of class C^0. Suppose that $I_\nu \in \mathcal{J}_\tau^0(M, \omega)$ is a sequence of ω-tame almost complex structures on M of class C^0 that converges to I in the C^0-topology. Fix a point $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ and a real number $r_0 > 0$. Suppose that $u_\nu\colon B_{r_0}(z_0) \to M$ is a sequence of I_ν-holomorphic curves and $u\colon B_{r_0}(z_0) \to M$ is an I-holomorphic curve such that the following holds.*

(a) *The sequence u_ν converges to u in the C^∞-topology on every compact subset of $B_{r_0}(z_0) \setminus \{z_0\}$.*

(b) *The limit*

$$m_0 := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \lim_{\nu \to \infty} E_{I_\nu}\big(u_\nu; B_\varepsilon(z_0)\big)$$

exists and is positive.

(c) *There exist constants $\delta, C > 0$ such that for all $z \in B_{r_0}(z_0)$ and all $r > 0$ with $B_r(z) \subset B_{r_0}(z_0)$, the curve u_ν satisfies a mean value inequality of the form*

$$E_{I_\nu}\big(u; B_r(z)\big) < \delta \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \big|\mathrm{d}u_\nu(z)\big|_{I_\nu}^2 \leq \frac{C}{r^2} \cdot E_{I_\nu}\big(u; B_r(z)\big) + C$$

for every ν.

Then there exist a sequence of automorphisms $\psi_\nu \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^1)$, an I-holomorphic sphere $v\colon \mathbb{P}^1 \to M$ and finitely many distinct points $z_1, \ldots, z_\ell, z_\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1$ such that, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the following holds.

(i) *The sequence ψ_ν converges to z_0 in the C^∞-topology on every compact subset of $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{z_\infty\} \cong \mathbb{C}$.*

(ii) *The sequence*

$$v_\nu := u_\nu \circ \psi_\nu\colon \psi_\nu^{-1}\big(B_{r_0}(z_0)\big) \longrightarrow M$$

converges to v in the C^∞-topology on every compact subset of $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{z_1, \ldots, z_\ell, z_\infty\}$, and the limits

$$m_j := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \lim_{\nu \to \infty} E_{I_\nu}\big(v_\nu; B_\varepsilon(z_j)\big)$$

exist and are positive for $j = 1, \ldots, \ell$.

(iii) *No energy gets lost in the limit, that is,*

$$E_I(v) + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} m_j = m_0.$$

(iv) *If v is constant, then $\ell \geq 2$.*

Moreover, bubbles connect in the sense that

$$u(z_0) = v(z_\infty),$$

and, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exist constants $\delta_0 > 0$ and ν_0 such that

$$\mathrm{d}(z, z_0) + \mathrm{d}\big((\psi_\nu)^{-1}(z), z_\infty\big) < \delta_0 \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \mathrm{d}\big(u_\nu(z), u(z_0)\big) < \epsilon$$

for every $\nu \geq \nu_0$ and every $z \in \mathbb{P}^1$.

The remainder of this subsection is devoted to the proof of Proposition 5.8. Our proof is essentially the same as the proof of Propositions 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 in [16] except for two differences, which we now discuss.

First, the almost complex structures I_ν and I are only of class C^0, and the sequence I_ν is assumed to converge to I only in the C^0-topology ([16] requires C^∞-convergence). This will cause problems in all arguments involving the derivatives of I_ν and I. Now the only part of the proof of Propositions 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 where the derivatives of I_ν and I come into play is when the mean value inequality for pseudoholomorphic curves of Lemma 4.3.1 in [16] is used. In fact, a careful examination of the proof of Lemma 4.3.1 in [16] shows that the constant δ in the statement of this lemma depends on the first and second derivatives of the almost complex structure. Hence the only difference between our proof of Proposition 5.8 and the proof of Propositions 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 resulting from the lack of regularity of I_ν and I is that we cannot apply the mean value inequality of Lemma 4.3.1. Instead, as a substitute for this inequality, we have to incorporate the Mean Value Inequality (c) into the assumptions of Proposition 5.8.

Second, the Mean Value Inequality (c) in the assumptions of Proposition 5.8 is slightly weaker than the mean value inequality of Lemma 4.3.1 in [16] since it contains an additive constant. Now the only step in the proof of Propositions 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 where Lemma 4.3.1 is used is in the proof of Lemma 4.7.3. We therefore need to amend the proof of Lemma 4.7.3, using the Mean Value Inequality (c) instead of the mean value inequality from Lemma 4.3.1. The result is formulated in Lemma 5.9. For $r < R$ we shall denote by

$$A(r, R) := \big\{z \in \mathbb{C} \,\big|\, r \leq |z| \leq R\big\}$$

the closed annulus in $\mathbb{C}$ of inner radius r and outer radius R centered at the origin.

Lemma 5.9. *Let (M, ω) be a compact symplectic manifold and let $I \in \mathcal{J}^0_\tau(M, \omega)$ be an ω-tame almost complex structure on M of class C^0. Fix constants $\delta, C > 0$. Then, for every $\mu < 1$, there exist constants $R_0, \delta_0, c > 0$ such that the following holds.*

Suppose that $0 < r < R < R_0$ with $R/r \geq 4$, and that $u\colon A(r, R) \to M$ is an I-holomorphic curve that satisfies a mean value inequality of the following form. For all $z \in A(r, R)$ and all $\rho > 0$ such that $B_\rho(z) \subset A(r, R)$,

$$E_I\big(u; B_\rho(z)\big) < \delta \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \frac{1}{2}\big|\mathrm{d}u(z)\big|_I^2 \leq \frac{C}{\rho^2} \cdot E_I\big(u; B_\rho(z)\big) + C. \tag{5.19}$$

Then if the energy of u *is sufficiently small in the sense that*

$$E_I(u) = E_I\big(u; A(r,R)\big) < \delta_0$$

we have estimates

$$E_I\big(u; A(e^T r, e^{-T} R)\big) \leq c \cdot e^{-2\mu T} \cdot E_I(u) \tag{5.20}$$

and

$$\sup_{z,z' \in A(e^T r, e^{-T} R)} \mathrm{d}\big(u(z), u(z')\big) \leq c \cdot \Big(e^{-\mu T} \cdot \sqrt{E_I(u)} + R\Big) \tag{5.21}$$

for $\log 2 \leq T \leq \log \sqrt{R/r}$.

Proof. The proof is adapted from the proof of Lemma 4.7.3 in McDuff and Salamon [16]. Let $0 < \mu < 1$ be fixed and define $c' = c'(\mu) := 1/4\pi\mu$.

We begin by recalling some notation from [16], Section 4.4. Let B denote the closed unit disc in $\mathbb{C}$ centered at the origin. For any smooth loop $\gamma\colon\ \partial B \to M$ we denote by

$$\ell(\gamma) := \int_0^{2\pi} |\dot\gamma(\theta)|_I \,\mathrm{d}\theta$$

its length with respect to the Riemannian metric $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_I$ on M determined by ω and I. If the length $\ell(\gamma)$ is smaller than the injectivity radius of M, then γ admits a smooth local extension $u_\gamma\colon B \to M$ such that

$$u_\gamma\big(e^{i\theta}\big) = \gamma(\theta)$$

for every $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, and the local symplectic action of γ is hence defined by

$$a(\gamma) := -\int_B u_\gamma^* \omega.$$

Note that this does not depend on the choice of local extension u_γ as long as the length of γ is smaller than the injectivity radius of M. As we have already seen in Section 2, the isoperimetric inequality of Theorem 4.4.1 in [16] continues to hold in our situation where the almost complex structure is only of class C^0. Since $c' > 1/4\pi$ by assumption, we thus have an isoperimetric inequality of the following form: There exists a constant $0 < \delta_0 \leq \delta$ such that

$$\ell(\gamma) < 4\pi\sqrt{C} \cdot \sqrt{\delta_0} \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad |a(\gamma)|_I \leq c' \cdot \ell(\gamma)^2 \tag{5.22}$$

for every smooth loop $\gamma\colon\ \partial B \to M$. Here δ and C are the constants from the hypothesis of the lemma.

Now we are ready to start with the actual proof of Inequality (5.20). For $r \leq \rho \leq R$ let $\gamma_\rho\colon\ \partial B \to M$ denote the loop defined by

$$\gamma_\rho(\theta) := u\big(\rho\, e^{i\theta}\big)$$

for $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. Furthermore, for $\log 2 \le t \le \log \sqrt{R/r}$ we define a smooth function $\varepsilon(t)$ that assigns to every t the energy of the curve u on the annulus $A(e^t r, e^{-t}R)$, that is,

$$\varepsilon(t) := E_I\Big(u; A\big(e^t r, e^{-t}R\big)\Big) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{A(e^t r, e^{-t}R)} |\mathrm{d}u|_I^2 .$$

Note that the condition $t \le \log \sqrt{R/r}$ ensures that $e^t r \le e^{-t}R$. Moreover, we will later need the condition $t \ge \log 2$ in order to be able to apply the Mean Value Inequality (5.19) from the assumptions.

Fix a number $\log 2 \le T \le \log \sqrt{R/r}$ and consider a point $z = \rho\, e^{i\theta} \in A(e^T r, e^{-T}R)$. Since $T \ge \log 2$ it follows that $2r \le \rho \le R/2$, whence the disc $B_\rho(z)$ is contained in the annulus $A(r, R)$. If $E_I(u) < \delta_0 \le \delta$, we may then apply the Mean Value Inequality (5.19), obtaining

$$\frac{1}{2}\big|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I^2 \le \frac{C}{\rho^2} \cdot E_I\big(u; B_\rho(z)\big) + C \le \frac{C}{r^2} \cdot E_I(u) + C. \tag{5.23}$$

Since $E_I(u) < \delta_0$ we get from this the following estimate for the norm of the derivative of γ_ρ in the direction of θ:

$$\big|\dot{\gamma_\rho}(\theta)\big|_I = \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \big|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I \le \sqrt{C \cdot E_I(u) + C \cdot r^2} \le \sqrt{C} \cdot \Big(\sqrt{\delta_0} + r\Big) .$$

Next we define

$$R_0 := \sqrt{\delta_0},$$

and assume for the remainder of this proof that $R < R_0$. We then obtain for the length of the loop γ_ρ the estimate

$$\ell(\gamma_\rho) = \int_0^{2\pi} \big|\dot{\gamma_\rho}(\theta)\big|_I \,\mathrm{d}\theta < 4\pi\sqrt{C} \cdot \sqrt{\delta_0}. \tag{5.24}$$

Hence it follows from the Isoperimetric Inequality (5.22) that

$$|a(\gamma_\rho)|_I \le c' \cdot \ell(\gamma_\rho)^2 \tag{5.25}$$

for $2r \le \rho \le R/2$.

As in [16], Remark 4.4.2, we denote by $u_\rho \colon B \to M$ the local extension of an arbitrary loop γ_ρ, defined by the formula

$$u_\rho\big(\rho' e^{i\theta}\big) := \exp_{\gamma_\rho(0)}\big(\rho'\, \xi(\theta)\big)$$

for $0 < \rho' < \rho$ and $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, where the map $\xi \colon [0, 2\pi] \to T_{\gamma_\rho(0)}M$ is determined by the condition

$$\exp_{\gamma_\rho(0)}\big(\xi(\theta)\big) = \gamma_\rho(\theta).$$

Let $\log 2 \le t \le \log \sqrt{R/r}$, and consider the sphere $v_t \colon S^2 \to M$ that is obtained from the restriction of the map u to the annulus $A(e^t r, e^{-t}R)$ by filling in the boundary circles $\gamma_{e^t r}$ and $\gamma_{e^{-t}R}$ with the local extensions $u_{e^t r}$ and $u_{e^{-t}R}$. The sphere $v_t \colon S^2 \to M$ is contractible because it is the boundary of the 3-ball consisting of the union of the discs $u_\rho\colon B \to M$ for $e^t r \le \rho \le e^{-t}R$. Hence

$$0 = \int_{S^2} v_t^*\omega = \int_{A(e^t r, e^{-t}R)} u^*\omega - \int_B u_{e^t r}^*\omega + \int_B u_{e^{-t}R}^*\omega.$$

To understand the minus sign on the right-hand side of this identity note that the discs $u_{e^t r}$ and $u_{e^{-t}R}$ have different orientation considered as submanifolds of the sphere S^2. Since the symplectic form ω tames the almost complex structure I, it follows from the energy identity from Lemma 2.2.1 in [16] that

$$E_I\Big(u; A\big(e^t r, e^{-t}R\big)\Big) = \int_{A(e^t r, e^{-t}R)} u^*\omega.$$

We may therefore write the previous identity in terms of the local symplectic action as

$$\varepsilon(t) = E_I\Big(u; A\big(e^t r, e^{-t}R\big)\Big) = -a(\gamma_{e^t r}) + a(\gamma_{e^{-t}R}).$$

Thus, applying the Isoperimetric Inequality (5.24) and Hölder's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\varepsilon(t) & = & -a(\gamma_{e^t r}) + a(\gamma_{e^{-t}R}) \\
 & \le & c' \cdot \ell(\gamma_{e^t r})^2 + c' \cdot \ell(\gamma_{e^{-t}R})^2 \\
 & \le & c' \cdot \left(\displaystyle\int_0^{2\pi} \big|\dot\gamma_{e^t r}(\theta)\big|_I \,\mathrm{d}\theta\right)^2 + c' \cdot \left(\displaystyle\int_0^{2\pi} \big|\dot\gamma_{e^{-t}R}(\theta)\big|_I \,\mathrm{d}\theta\right)^2 \\
 & = & \dfrac{c'(e^t r)^2}{2} \cdot \left(\displaystyle\int_0^{2\pi} \big|\mathrm{d}u(e^t r e^{i\theta})\big|_I \,\mathrm{d}\theta\right)^2 + \dfrac{c'(e^{-t}R)^2}{2} \cdot \left(\displaystyle\int_0^{2\pi} \big|\mathrm{d}u(e^{-t}R e^{i\theta})\big|_I \,\mathrm{d}\theta\right)^2 \\
 & \le & 2\pi c' \cdot \left(\dfrac{1}{2}(e^t r)^2 \cdot \displaystyle\int_0^{2\pi} \big|\mathrm{d}u(e^t r e^{i\theta})\big|_I^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta + \dfrac{1}{2}(e^{-t}R)^2 \cdot \displaystyle\int_0^{2\pi} \big|\mathrm{d}u(e^{-t}R e^{i\theta})\big|_I^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta\right).
\end{array}$$

To estimate this further, recall that

$$\varepsilon(t) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{A(e^t r, e^{-t}R)} |\mathrm{d}u|_I^2 = \frac{1}{2}\int_{e^t r}^{e^{-t}R} \rho \int_0^{2\pi} \big|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta\,\mathrm{d}\rho,$$

whence

$$\dot\varepsilon(t) = -\frac{1}{2}(e^t r)^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \big|\mathrm{d}u\big(e^t r e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta - \frac{1}{2}(e^{-t}R)^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \big|\mathrm{d}u\big(e^{-t}R e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I^2 \,\mathrm{d}\theta.$$

We see from this computation that the function $\varepsilon(t)$ is of class C^1 in t even though the almost complex structure I and hence also the norm $|\cdot|_I$ on M are only of class C^0. Hence we conclude that

$$\varepsilon(t) \le -2\pi c' \cdot \dot\varepsilon(t).$$

Because $\mu = 1/4\pi c'$ this implies

$$\dot\varepsilon(t) \le -2\mu \cdot \varepsilon(t) < 0.$$

Now let $\log 2 \leq T \leq \log \sqrt{R/r}$. Integrating this differential inequality from $\log 2$ to T, it follows that

$$\varepsilon(T) \leq e^{-2\mu(T-\log 2)} \cdot \varepsilon(\log 2) \leq e^{-2\mu T} e^{2\mu} \cdot E_I(u). \tag{5.26}$$

This proves Inequality (5.20).

We next prove Inequality (5.21), starting with the following observation.

Claim. *Let $r \leq \rho_1 < \rho_2 \leq R$ such that $\rho_2/\rho_1 \geq 4$, and set $\rho_0 := \sqrt{\rho_1\rho_2}$. Let also $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. Then the restriction of the map u to the annulus $A(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ satisfies the following estimates.*

(i) *If $2\rho_1 \leq \rho \leq \rho_0$, then*

$$\left|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\right|_I^2 \leq \frac{36\, C\, e^{2\mu}}{\rho^2} \cdot \left(\frac{\rho_1}{\rho}\right)^{2\mu} \cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1, \rho_2)\big) + C. \tag{5.27}$$

(ii) *If $\rho_0 \leq \rho \leq \rho_2/2$, then*

$$\left|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\right|_I^2 \leq \frac{36\, C\, e^{2\mu}}{\rho^2} \cdot \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_2}\right)^{2\mu} \cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1, \rho_2)\big) + C. \tag{5.28}$$

Proof of claim. Assume that $2\rho_1 \leq \rho \leq \rho_2/2$. We then have

$$\rho/\rho_1 \leq \rho_2/\rho \quad \text{for} \quad \rho \leq \rho_0$$

and

$$\rho/\rho_1 \geq \rho_2/\rho \quad \text{for} \quad \rho \geq \rho_0.$$

We distinguish four cases for ρ.

Case 1: $2\rho_1 \leq \rho \leq 2e\rho_1$. The disc $B_{\rho/2}(\rho e^{i\theta})$ is contained in the annulus $A(\rho_1, \rho_2)$. If $E_I(u) < \delta_0 \leq \delta$, we may therefore apply the Mean Value Inequality (5.19) obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\right|_I^2 &\leq \frac{4\, C}{\rho^2} \cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1, \rho_2)\big) + C \\
&\leq \frac{4\, C}{\rho^2} \cdot \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_1}\right)^{2\mu} \cdot \left(\frac{\rho_1}{\rho}\right)^{2\mu} \cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1, \rho_2)\big) + C \\
&\leq \frac{16\, C\, e^{2\mu}}{\rho^2} \cdot \left(\frac{\rho_1}{\rho}\right)^{2\mu} \cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1, \rho_2)\big) + C.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality we used that $\rho/\rho_1 \leq 2e$, whence $(\rho/\rho_1)^{2\mu} \leq 4e^{2\mu}$.

Case 2: $2e\rho_1 \leq \rho \leq \rho_0$. The disc $B_{\rho/2}(\rho e^{i\theta})$ is contained in the annulus $A(\rho/e, e\rho)$. If $E_I(u) < \delta_0 \leq \delta$, we may therefore apply the Mean Value Inequality (5.19) obtaining

$$\left|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\right|_I^2 \leq \frac{4\, C}{\rho^2} \cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho/e, e\rho)\big) + C.$$

In order to estimate this further, we apply Inequality (5.26) to the annulus

$$A\big(e^{\log(\rho/\rho_1)-1}\cdot\rho_1, e^{-\log(\rho/\rho_1)+1}\cdot\rho_2\big)\supset A(\rho/e, e\rho).$$

We get

$$E\Big(u; A\big(e^{\log(\rho/\rho_1)-1}\cdot\rho_1, e^{-\log(\rho/\rho_1)+1}\cdot\rho_2\big)\Big)\le e^{4\mu}\cdot e^{-2\mu\log(\rho/\rho_1)}\cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big).$$

Therefore

$$\big|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I^2\le\frac{36\,C\,e^{2\mu}}{\rho^2}\cdot\left(\frac{\rho_1}{\rho}\right)^{2\mu}\cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)+C.$$

Case 3: $\rho_0\le\rho\le\rho_2/2e$. The disc $B_{\rho/2}(\rho e^{i\theta})$ is contained in the annulus $A(\rho/e, e\rho)$. If $E_I(u)<\delta_0\le\delta$, we may therefore apply the Mean Value Inequality (5.19) obtaining

$$\big|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I^2\le\frac{4\,C}{\rho^2}\cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho/e, e\rho)\big)+C.$$

In order to estimate this further, we again apply Inequality (5.26) to the annulus

$$A\big(e^{\log(\rho_2/\rho)-1}\cdot\rho_1, e^{-\log(\rho_2/\rho)+1}\cdot\rho_2\big)\supset A(\rho/e, e\rho).$$

We get

$$E\Big(u; A\big(e^{\log(\rho_2/\rho)-1}\cdot\rho_1, e^{-\log(\rho_2/\rho)+1}\cdot\rho_2\big)\Big)\le e^{4\mu}\cdot e^{-2\mu\log(\rho_2/\rho)}\cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big).$$

Therefore

$$\big|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I^2\le\frac{36\,C\,e^{2\mu}}{\rho^2}\cdot\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_2}\right)^{2\mu}\cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)+C.$$

Case 4: $\rho_2/2e\le\rho\le\rho_2/2$. The disc $B_{\rho/2}(\rho e^{i\theta})$ is contained in the annulus $A(\rho_1,\rho_2)$. If $E_I(u)<\delta_0\le\delta$, we may therefore apply the Mean Value Inequality (5.19) obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I^2&\le\frac{4\,C}{\rho^2}\cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)+C\\&\le\frac{4\,C}{\rho^2}\cdot\left(\frac{\rho_2}{\rho}\right)^{2\mu}\cdot\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_2}\right)^{2\mu}\cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)+C\\&\le\frac{16\,C\,e^{2\mu}}{\rho^2}\cdot\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_2}\right)^{2\mu}\cdot E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)+C.\end{aligned}$$

Note that for the last inequality we used that $\rho_2/\rho\le 2e$, so that $(\rho_2/\rho)^{2\mu}\le 4e^{2\mu}$. □

Let now $\log 2\le t\le\log(\rho_2/\rho_0)$. For $\rho_0\le\rho\le\rho_2/2$, Inequality (5.28) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I&\le\frac{18\sqrt{C}}{\rho}\cdot\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_2}\right)^{\mu}\cdot\sqrt{E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)}+\sqrt{C}\\&=18\sqrt{C}\cdot\frac{\rho^{\mu-1}}{\rho_2^{\mu}}\cdot\sqrt{E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)}+\sqrt{C}.\end{aligned}$$

For any point $s_0 e^{i\theta_0}$ such that $\rho_0 \leq s_0 \leq e^{-t}\rho_2$ and $0 \leq \theta_0 \leq 2\pi$, integrating the last inequality then yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{d}_I\big(u(\rho_0), u(s_0 e^{it_0})\big)\\
\leq\;& \int_{\rho_0}^{s_0} \big|\partial_\rho u(\rho)\big|_I \,\mathrm{d}\rho + \int_0^{\theta_0} \big|\partial_\theta u\big(s_0 e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I \,\mathrm{d}\theta\\
\leq\;& 18\sqrt{C}\cdot\left(\int_{\rho_0}^{s_0} \frac{\rho^{\mu-1}}{\rho_2^{\mu}}\,\mathrm{d}\rho + \int_0^{\theta_0}\left(\frac{s_0}{\rho_2}\right)^{\mu}\mathrm{d}\theta\right)\cdot\sqrt{E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)}\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad + \big(s_0 - \rho_0 + s_0\theta_0\big)\cdot\sqrt{C}\\
\leq\;& 18\sqrt{C}\cdot\left(\int_{0}^{e^{-t}\rho_2} \frac{\rho^{\mu-1}}{\rho_2^{\mu}}\,\mathrm{d}\rho + \int_0^{2\pi}\left(\frac{e^{-t}\rho_2}{\rho_2}\right)^{\mu}\mathrm{d}\theta\right)\cdot\sqrt{E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)}\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad + e^{-t}\rho_2\cdot(1+2\pi)\cdot\sqrt{C}\\
=\;& 18\sqrt{C}\cdot\left(\frac{(e^{-t}\rho_2)^{\mu}}{\mu\cdot\rho_2^{\mu}} + 2\pi\cdot e^{-\mu t}\right)\cdot\sqrt{E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)} + \rho_2\cdot(1+2\pi)\cdot\sqrt{C}\\
=\;& 18\sqrt{C}\cdot\left(\frac{1}{\mu} + 2\pi\right)\cdot e^{-\mu t}\cdot\sqrt{E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)} + \rho_2\cdot(1+2\pi)\cdot\sqrt{C}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $2\rho_1 \leq \rho \leq \rho_0$, Inequality (5.27) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\mathrm{d}u\big(\rho e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I &\leq \frac{18\sqrt{C}}{\rho}\cdot\left(\frac{\rho_1}{\rho}\right)^{\mu}\cdot\sqrt{E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)} + \sqrt{C}\\
&= 18\sqrt{C}\cdot\frac{\rho_1^{\mu}}{\rho^{\mu+1}}\cdot\sqrt{E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)} + \sqrt{C},
\end{aligned}$$

and for any point $s_1 e^{i\theta_1}$ with $e^{t}\rho_1 \leq s_1 \leq \rho_0$ and $0 \leq \theta_1 \leq 2\pi$, integrating this inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{d}_I\big(u(\rho_0), u(s_1 e^{it_1})\big)\\
\leq\;& \int_{s_1}^{\rho_0} \big|\partial_\rho u(\rho)\big|_I \,\mathrm{d}\rho + \int_0^{\theta_1} \big|\partial_\theta u\big(s_0 e^{i\theta}\big)\big|_I \,\mathrm{d}\theta\\
\leq\;& 18\sqrt{C}\cdot\left(\int_{s_1}^{\rho_0} \frac{\rho_1^{\mu}}{\rho^{\mu+1}}\,\mathrm{d}\rho + \int_0^{\theta_1}\left(\frac{\rho_1}{s_1}\right)^{\mu}\mathrm{d}\theta\right)\cdot\sqrt{E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)}\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad + \big(\rho_0 - s_1 + s_1\theta_1\big)\cdot\sqrt{C}\\
\leq\;& 18\sqrt{C}\cdot\left(\int_{e^{t}\rho_1}^{0} \frac{\rho_1^{\mu}}{\rho^{\mu+1}}\,\mathrm{d}\rho + \int_0^{2\pi}\left(\frac{\rho_1}{e^{t}\rho_1}\right)^{\mu}\mathrm{d}\theta\right)\cdot\sqrt{E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)}\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad + e^{t}\rho_1\cdot(2\pi-1)\cdot\sqrt{C}\\
=\;& 18\sqrt{C}\cdot\left(\frac{\rho_1^{\mu}}{\mu\cdot(e^{t}\rho_1)^{\mu}} + 2\pi\cdot e^{-\mu t}\right)\cdot\sqrt{E_I\big(u; A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)} + \rho_2\cdot(1+2\pi)\cdot\sqrt{C}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \; 18\sqrt{C}\cdot\left(\frac{1}{\mu}+2\pi\right)\cdot e^{-\mu t}\cdot\sqrt{E_I\big(u;A(\rho_1,\rho_2)\big)}+\rho_2\cdot(1+2\pi)\cdot\sqrt{C}.$$

This proves Inequality (5.21). □

Comparing the statement of Lemma 5.9 with the statement of Lemma 4.7.3 in [16] we see that there are precisely two differences. For, in Lemma 5.9, the annulus $A(r,R)$ is assumed to be sufficiently small in the sense that $R<R_0$, and Inequality (5.21) contains an additional additive constant R.

A careful examination of the proofs of Propositions 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 in [16] now shows that Lemma 4.7.3 is used in these proofs exactly three times, once in the proof of Lemma 4.7.4, and twice in the proof of Proposition 4.7.1 (see p.103 in [16]).

Let us discuss the proof of Lemma 4.7.4 first. In this proof, Lemma 4.7.3 is applied to the I_ν-holomorphic curve $u_\nu\colon A(\delta^\nu/\rho,\rho)\to M$ (we use our notation), where $\rho>0$ is sufficiently small and ν sufficiently large. Now the Mean Value Inequality (c) in the hypothesis of Proposition 5.8 ensures that the curve u_ν indeed satisfies the requirements of Lemma 5.9. Then, replacing Lemma 4.7.3 by Lemma 5.9, we proceed in the proof of Lemma 4.7.4 as follows. First, we have to assume that $\rho>0$ is such that $\rho<R_0$, where $R_0>0$ is the constant from Lemma 5.9. This is no loss of generality since we are only interested in the situation where $\rho\to 0$. If $2\rho\le r$, then $A(\delta^\nu/2\rho,2\rho)\subset A(\delta^\nu/r,r)$. Applying Inequality (5.21) to the annulus $A(\delta^\nu/2\rho,2\rho)$ with $T=\log 2$, we obtain constants $\delta',c'>0$ such that

$$E^\nu(2\rho)<\delta' \quad\Longrightarrow\quad \sup_{z,z'\in A(\delta^\nu/\rho,\rho)}\mathrm{d}\big(u_\nu(z),u_\nu(z')\big)\le c'\cdot\sqrt{E^\nu(2\rho)}+c'\cdot\rho.$$

Take the limit $\nu\to\infty$ to obtain

$$E(2\rho)<\delta' \quad\Longrightarrow\quad \mathrm{d}\big(u(\rho),v(1/\rho)\big)=\lim_{\nu\to\infty}\mathrm{d}\big(u_\nu(\rho),u_\nu(\delta^\nu/\rho)\big)\le c'\cdot\sqrt{E^\nu(2\rho)}+c'\cdot\rho.$$

Here we use the notation

$$E^\nu(2\rho):=E_{I_\nu}\big(u_\nu;A(\delta^\nu/\rho,\rho)\big)\quad\text{and}\quad E(2\rho):=\lim_{\nu\to\infty}E^\nu(2\rho)$$

as in [16]. Finally we let $\rho\to 0$ to obtain $u(0)=v(\infty)$. The proof of Lemma 4.7.4 now proceeds exactly as in [16].

Next we discuss the proof of Proposition 4.7.1. In the proof on p. 103 in [16] the first Estimate (4.7.1) of Lemma 4.7.3 is applied to the annuli $A(\delta^\nu,\varepsilon^\nu)$, where $\varepsilon^\nu,\delta^\nu\to 0$. Since Estimate (4.7.1) is exactly the same as Estimate (5.20) in Lemma 5.9 above, it only remains to verify that Lemma 5.9 does in fact apply to this situation. As already explained, the curve u_ν satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 5.9 because of the Mean Value Inequality (c) in the hypothesis of Proposition 5.8. Moreover, since $\varepsilon^\nu\to 0$, and as we are interested in the limit $\nu\to\infty$, we may, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, assume that $\varepsilon^\nu<R_0$, where $R_0>0$ is the constant of Lemma 5.9. Then the proof of Proposition 4.7.1 proceeds as in [16].

Thus we have shown that, with the above modifications, the proofs of Propositions 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 in [16] carry over to our situation, and so the proof of Proposition 5.8 is now complete.

5.3. **Proof of Gromov compactness.**

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.8 on Gromov compactness for vortices. Our strategy is to adapt the proof of Theorem 5.3.1 on Gromov convergence for pseudoholomorphic curves in McDuff and Salamon [16], replacing the statements of Theorem 4.6.1 and Propositions 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 in [16] with the corresponding statements of Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 5.8.

So fix a nonnegative integer n, a smooth family $J\colon \Sigma \to \mathcal{J}_G(M,\omega)$ of G-invariant ω-compatible almost complex structures on M, and a complex structure j_Σ and an area form dvol_Σ on Σ. Then consider a sequence $(A_\nu, u_\nu, \mathbf{z}_\nu)$ of n-marked vortices whose Yang-Mills-Higgs energy satisfies a uniform bound

$$\sup_\nu E(A_\nu, u_\nu) < \infty.$$

Our goal is to construct a rooted n-labeled tree $T = (V = \{0\} \sqcup V_S, E, \Lambda)$ and a polystable vortex

$$\big(A, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}\big) = \big((A, u_0), \{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in V_S}, \{z_{\alpha\beta}\}_{\alpha E \beta}, \{\alpha_i, z_i\}_{1 \le i \le n}\big) \tag{5.29}$$

of combinatorial type T such that the sequence $(A_\nu, u_\nu, \mathbf{z}_\nu)$ Gromov converges to $(A, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z})$ in the sense of Definition 1.7.

We shall proceed in nine steps.

Step 1 We fix a root vertex 0 and associate to it the principal component $\Sigma_0 := \Sigma$.

Step 2 We apply Theorem 4.1 to the sequence of vortices (A_ν, u_ν). The conclusion is that there exists a smooth vortex (A, u_0), a real number $p > 2$, a sequence of gauge transformations $g_\nu \in \mathcal{G}^{2,p}(P)$, and a finite set $Z_0 = \{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_N\}$ of bubbling points on Σ_0 such that, after passing to a subsequence if necessary,

(i) the sequence $g_\nu^* A_\nu$ converges to A strongly in the C^0-topology on Σ_0;

(ii) the sequence $g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu$ converges to u_0 strongly in the C^∞-topology on compact subsets of $\Sigma_0 \setminus Z_0$;

(iii) for every $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j) \cap Z_0 = \{\zeta_j\}$ the limit

$$m_\varepsilon(\zeta_j) := \lim_{\nu \to \infty} E\big(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu; B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)\big)$$

exists and is a continuous function of ε, and

$$m(\zeta_j) := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} m_\varepsilon(\zeta_j) \ge \hbar,$$

where $\hbar$ is the constant of Corollary 2.2;

(iv) for every compact subset $K \subset \Sigma_0$ such that Z_0 is contained in the interior of K,

$$E\big(A, u_0; K\big) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} m(\zeta_j) = \lim_{\nu\to\infty} E\big(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu; K\big).$$

Step 3 We apply Proposition 5.1 to the vortex (A, u_0). Hence there exists a symplectic form ω_A and an almost complex structure J_A on the compact manifold $P(M)$ such that J_A is tamed by ω_A, and the section $u_0 \colon \Sigma_0 \to P(M)$ (in the sense of Remark 1.4) becomes a (j_{Σ_0}, J_A)-holomorphic curve.

Step 4 After passing to a subsequence if necessary, we apply Proposition 5.1 to the sequence of vortices $(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu)$. By (i) in Step 2, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the sequence $(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu)$ does in fact satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 5.1. We obtain a sequence of ω_A-tame almost complex structures $J_\nu := J_{g_\nu^* A_\nu}$ on $P(M)$ that converges to J_A strongly in the C^0-topology and such that

(v) the curve $g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu \colon \Sigma_0 \to P(M)$ is (j_{Σ_0}, J_ν)-holomorphic for every ν;

(vi) the energy of the curve $g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu$ satisfies a uniform bound

$$\sup_\nu E_{J_\nu}\big(g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu\big) < \infty;$$

(vii) there exist constants $r_0 > 0$ and $\delta, C > 0$, not depending on ν, such that for every ν the curve u_ν satisfies a mean value inequality of the following form. For all $z_0 \in \Sigma_0$ and all $0 < r < r_0$,

$$E_{J_\nu}\big(g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu; B_r(z_0)\big) < \delta \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \big|\mathrm{d}\big(g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu\big)(z_0)\big|_{J_\nu}^2 \le \frac{C}{r^2} \cdot E_{J_\nu}\big(g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu; B_r(z_0)\big) + C.$$

Note that in order to obtain (vi) we use that $\sup_\nu E(A_\nu, u_\nu) < \infty$ by assumption.

Step 5 We rephrase Assertions (iii) and (iv) in Step 2 above in terms of the energy of the sequence $g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu$. More precisely, we claim that

(iii') for every $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j) \cap Z_0 = \{\zeta_j\}$ the limit

$$m'_\varepsilon(\zeta_j) := \lim_{\nu\to\infty} E_{J_\nu}\big(g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu; B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)\big)$$

exists and is a continuous function of ε, and

$$m'(\zeta_j) := \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} m'_\varepsilon(\zeta_j) \ge \hbar,$$

where $\hbar$ is the constant of Corollary 2.2;

(iv') for every compact subset $K \subset \Sigma_0$ such that Z_0 is contained in the interior of K,

$$E\big(A, u_0; K\big) + \sum_{j=1}^{N} m'(\zeta_j) = \lim_{\nu\to\infty} E\big(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu; K\big).$$

To see this, we first note that, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, it follows as in the proof of Theorem 4.6.1 in [16] that the limit $m'_\varepsilon(z_j)$ exists and is a continuous function of ε, for $j = 1, \dots, N$. Assertions (iii') and (iv') then follow from Assertions (iii) and (iv) in Step 2 once we show that

$$m'(\zeta_j) = m(\zeta_j) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, N,$$

which we will do now. To simplify notation, we write $\hat{A}_\nu := g_\nu^* A_\nu$ and $\hat{u}_\nu := g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu$. Let $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. By definition, the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of the vortex $(\hat{A}_\nu, \hat{u}_\nu)$ on $B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)$ is given by

$$E\big(\hat{A}_\nu, \hat{u}_\nu; B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)\big) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} \big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu} \hat{u}_\nu\big|_J^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0} + \int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} \big|\mu(\hat{u}_\nu)\big|^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0}, \tag{5.30}$$

and the energy of the curve $\hat{u}_\nu \colon \Sigma_0 \to P(M)$ on $B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)$ is given by

$$E_{J_\nu}\big(\hat{u}_\nu; B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)\big) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} \big|\mathrm{d}\hat{u}_\nu\big|_{J_\nu}^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0}. \tag{5.31}$$

It follows from (5.12) and (5.13) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\mathrm{d}\hat{u}_\nu(v)\big|_{J_\nu}^2 &= \big|\big[\tilde{v}, \mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu}\hat{u}_\nu(\tilde{v})\big]\big|_{J_\nu}^2 \\
&= \omega_A\Big(\big[\tilde{v}, \mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu}\hat{u}_\nu(\tilde{v})\big], J_{\hat{A}_\nu}\big[\tilde{v}, \mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu}\hat{u}_\nu(\tilde{v})\big]\Big) \\
&= \big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu}\hat{u}_\nu(\tilde{v})\big|_J^2 + \omega\big(X_{A(\tilde{v})}, J\,\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu}\hat{u}_\nu(\tilde{v})\big) + \omega\big(\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu}\hat{u}_\nu(\tilde{v}), X_{A((\pi^* j_{\Sigma_0})\tilde{v})}\big) \\
&\qquad + \omega\big(X_{A(\tilde{v})}, X_{A((\pi^* j_{\Sigma_0})\tilde{v})}\big) \\
&\quad - \big\langle F_A\big(\tilde{v}, (\pi^* j_\Sigma)\tilde{v}\big), \mu\big\rangle + (1 + c_{A,\mu}) \cdot |\mathrm{d}\pi(\tilde{v})|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

for $v \in T\Sigma_0$, where $\tilde{v} \in TP$ denotes the A_ν-horizontal lift of v. As in the proof of Lemma 5.6, we further obtain from this the estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\mathrm{d}\hat{u}_\nu(v)\big|_{J_\nu}^2 \le \big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu}\hat{u}_\nu(v)\big|_J^2 &+ 2c \cdot |v| \cdot \big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu}\hat{u}_\nu(v)\big|_J^2 \cdot \big\|\hat{A}_\nu - A\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma_0)} \\
&+ c^2 \cdot |v|^2 \cdot \big\|\hat{A}_\nu - A\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma_0)}^2 + 2\, c_{A,\mu} \cdot |v|^2
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu}\hat{u}_\nu(v)\big|_J^2 \le \big|\mathrm{d}\hat{u}_\nu(v)\big|_{J_\nu}^2 &+ 2c \cdot |v| \cdot \big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu}\hat{u}_\nu(v)\big|_J^2 \cdot \big\|\hat{A}_\nu - A\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma_0)} \\
&+ c^2 \cdot |v|^2 \cdot \big\|\hat{A}_\nu - A\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma_0)}^2 + |v|^2
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c > 0$ not depending on $(\hat{A}_\nu, \hat{u}_\nu)$. Passing to operator norms, we obtain inequalities

$$\big|\mathrm{d}\hat{u}_\nu\big|_{J_\nu}^2 \le \big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu}\hat{u}_\nu\big|_J^2 + f_\nu \qquad \text{and} \qquad \big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu}\hat{u}_\nu\big|_J^2 \le \big|\mathrm{d}\hat{u}_\nu\big|_{J_\nu}^2 + f_\nu, \tag{5.32}$$

where we abbreviate

$$f_\nu := 1 + 2\, c_{A,\mu} + 2c \cdot \big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu} \hat{u}_\nu\big|_J^2 \cdot \big\|\hat{A}_\nu - A\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma_0)} + c^2 \cdot \big\|\hat{A}_\nu - A\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma_0)}^2 .$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} f_\nu \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0} = 2c \cdot \big\|\hat{A}_\nu - A\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma_0)} \cdot \int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} \big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu} \hat{u}_\nu\big|_J^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0} \\ + \Big(1 + 2\, c_{A,\mu} + c^2 \cdot \big\|\hat{A}_\nu - A\big\|_{C^0(\Sigma_0)}^2\Big) \cdot \mathrm{Vol}\big(B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)\big).\end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit $\nu \to \infty$, we get

$$\lim_{\nu\to\infty} \int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} f_\nu \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0} = \big(1 + 2\, c_{A,\mu}\big) \cdot \mathrm{Vol}\big(B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)\big).$$

Here we used that $\hat{A}_\nu$ converges to A in the C^0-topology on Σ_0 and that

$$\sup_\nu \int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} \big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu} \hat{u}_\nu\big|_J^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0} < \infty$$

since the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy of $(\hat{A}_\nu, \hat{u}_\nu)$ is uniformly bounded by assumption. Combining this with (5.32), (5.30) and (5.31) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} m_\varepsilon(\zeta_j) &= \lim_{\nu\to\infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} \big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu} \hat{u}_\nu\big|_J^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0} + \lim_{\nu\to\infty} \int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} \big|\mu(\hat{u}_\nu)\big|^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0} \\ &\le \lim_{\nu\to\infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} \big|\mathrm{d}\hat{u}_\nu\big|_{J_\nu}^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0} + \Big(1 + 2\, c_{A,\mu} + \big\|\mu\big\|_{C^0(M)}^2\Big) \cdot \mathrm{Vol}\big(B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)\big) \\ &= m'_\varepsilon(\zeta_j) + \Big(1 + 2\, c_{A,\mu} + \big\|\mu\big\|_{C^0(M)}^2\Big) \cdot \mathrm{Vol}\big(B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)\big) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} m'_\varepsilon(\zeta_j) &= \lim_{\nu\to\infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} \big|\mathrm{d}\hat{u}_\nu\big|_{J_\nu}^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0} \\ &\le \lim_{\nu\to\infty} \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} \big|\mathrm{d}_{\hat{A}_\nu} \hat{u}_\nu\big|_J^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0} + \lim_{\nu\to\infty} \int_{B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)} \big|\mu(\hat{u}_\nu)\big|^2 \,\mathrm{dvol}_{\Sigma_0} \\ &\qquad + \big(1 + 2\, c_{A,\mu}\big) \cdot \mathrm{Vol}\big(B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)\big) \\ &= m_\varepsilon(\zeta_j) + \big(1 + 2\, c_{A,\mu}\big) \cdot \mathrm{Vol}\big(B_\varepsilon(\zeta_j)\big). \end{aligned}$$

Finally letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, we thus obtain

$$m(\zeta_j) \le m'(\zeta_j) \qquad \text{and} \qquad m'(\zeta_j) \le m(\zeta_j).$$

Whence $m'(\zeta_j) = m(\zeta_j)$. This finishes the proof of Assertions (iii') and (iv').

Step 6 We prove that the sequence of n-marked J_ν-holomorphic curves $(g_\nu^{-1} u_\nu, \mathbf{z}_\nu)$ Gromov converges to a stable map $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z})$ of combinatorial type $T = (V = \{0\} \sqcup V_S, E, \Lambda)$ in the sense of Definition 5.2.1 in [16], except that

(viii) we assume that Σ_0 is of arbitrary genus but does not admit any automorphisms other than the identity.

We claim that the proof is the same as the proof of Theorem 5.3.1 in [16], except for the modification (viii). In fact, the proof of Theorem 5.3.1 in [16] is based on Theorem 4.6.1 and Propositions 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 in [16]. Therefore all we need to do is replace the statements of Theorem 4.6.1 with the corresponding statements (i), (ii), (iii') and (iv') above, and the statements of Propositions 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 with the corresponding statements of Proposition 5.8, applied to the sequence of J_ν-holomorphic curves $g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu$. We shall appeal to Proposition 5.8 in the following situation. We take (see Step 4)

- the compact symplectic manifold (M,ω) to be the manifold $(P(M),\omega_A)$;
- the almost complex structures I_ν and I on M to be the almost complex structures J_ν and J_A on $P(M)$, respectively;
- the sequence of I_ν-holomorphic curves u_ν to be the sequence of J_ν-holomorphic curves
$$g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu\colon \Sigma_0 \longrightarrow P(M).$$

Note that it follows from (ii), (iii') and Step 4 that the assumptions of Proposition 5.8 are indeed satisfied by the sequence of J_ν-holomorphic curves $g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu$.

So the proof of Theorem 5.3.1 in [16] carries over except for the modification (viii). In our case the principal component Σ_0 will be a distinguished component of the stable map $\mathbf{u}$. As a consequence, we have to modify the base step in the induction argument in the proof of Theorem 5.3.1 in [16] (see p. 119 in [16]) in the following way.

We define the set Z_1 in [16] to be the set
$$Z_1 := Z_0 = \{\zeta_1,\dots,\zeta_N\}$$
of bubbling points on the principal component Σ_0 obtained in Step 2. Then

- there exists a positive real number r such that $B_r(\zeta_j)\cap Z_1 = \{\zeta_j\}$ for each $j=1,\dots,N$;
- there exist holomorphic discs $\varphi_j\colon \mathbb{C}\supset B\to B_r(\zeta_j)$ such that $\varphi_j(0)=\zeta_j$ for each $j=1,\dots,N$, where B denotes the closed unit disc.

Moreover, we define the sequence of automorphisms ϕ_1^ν of $\mathbb{C}$ in [16] to be trivial, that is,
$$\phi_1^\nu := \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{C}}$$
for all ν. Then it follows from Assertion (ii) above that, for every $j=1,\dots,N$, the sequence
$$\big(g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu\big)\circ\varphi_j = \big(g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu\big)\circ\varphi_j\circ\phi_1^\nu\colon B\longrightarrow P(M) \tag{5.33}$$
converges to
$$u_0\circ\varphi_j\colon B\longrightarrow P(M)$$
strongly in the C^∞-topology on every compact subset of the punctured disc $B\setminus\{0\}$. Hence we may apply Proposition 5.8 to the sequence of J_ν-holomorphic curves (5.33),

for $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. This shows that the inductive step of the proof of Theorem 5.3.1 in [16] is valid for the sequence of curves (5.33).

It follows that the sequence $(g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu, \mathbf{z}_\nu)$ Gromov converges to a stable map

$$(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}) = \big(u_0, \{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in V_S}, \{z_{\alpha\beta}\}_{\alpha E \beta}, \{\alpha_i, z_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}\big)$$

of combinatorial type $T = (V = \{0\} \sqcup V_S, E, \Lambda)$. This stable map has a distinguished principal component Σ_0 corresponding to the root vertex 0 of the tree T.

Step 7 We define the polystable vortex (5.29) to be the polystable vortex that consists of the vortex (A, u_0) on the principal component Σ_0 obtained in Step 2 and the stable map $(\mathbf{u}$,$\mathbf{z})$ obtained in Step 6.

Step 8 It follows from the convergence of $(g_\nu^* A_\nu, u_\nu^{-1}u_\nu)$ against (A, u) proved in (i) and (ii) in Step 2 and Gromov convergence of the sequence $(g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu, \mathbf{z}_\nu)$ against the stable curve $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z})$ proved in Step 6 that the sequence of marked vortices $(A_\nu, u_\nu, \mathbf{z}_\nu)$ Gromov converges against the polystable vortex (5.29) in the sense of Definition 1.7 except for the (Energy) axiom.

Step 9 We check that the (Energy) axiom in Definition 1.7 is also satisfied. In fact, since $(g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu, \mathbf{z}_\nu)$ Gromov converges against the stable map $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z})$ it follows from Definition 5.2.1 in [16] that

$$\sum_{\gamma \in T_{0\alpha}} E_{J_A}(u_\gamma) = m_{0\alpha}(\mathbf{u}) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \lim_{\nu \to \infty} E_{J_\nu}\big(g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu; B_\varepsilon(z_{0\alpha})\big)$$

for every $\alpha \in V_S$ such that $0E\alpha$. Here we used that $u_0^\nu = (g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu) \circ \phi_0^\nu = g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu$. On the other hand, we know from (iv') in Step 5 that

$$E(A, u_0) + \sum_{\alpha \in V_S, 0E\alpha} \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \lim_{\nu \to \infty} E_{J_\nu}\big(g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu; B_\varepsilon(z_{0\alpha})\big) = \lim_{\nu \to \infty} E\big(g_\nu^* A_\nu, g_\nu^{-1}u_\nu\big).$$

Hence by gauge invariance of the Yang-Mills-Higgs energy we get

$$\lim_{\nu \to \infty} E(A_\nu, u_\nu) = E(A, u_0) + \sum_{\alpha \in V_S} E_{J_A}(u_\alpha).$$

Now we see from the definition of the almost complex structure J_A on $P(M)$ in Section 5.1 that J_A and J agree on the fibers of $P(M)$. Since the curve u_α maps into the fiber $P(M)_{z_{0\alpha}}$ over the bubbling point $z_{0\alpha} \in \Sigma_0$, it thus follows that $E_{J_A}(u_\alpha) = E_{J_{z_{0\alpha}}}(u_\alpha)$. We conclude that

$$\lim_{\nu \to \infty} E(A_\nu, u_\nu) = E(A, u_0) + \sum_{\alpha \in V_S} E_{J_{z_{0\alpha}}}(u_\alpha) = E(A, \mathbf{u}).$$

This proves the (Energy) axiom.

Thus, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, the sequence of n-marked vortices $(A_\nu, u_\nu, \mathbf{z}_\nu)$ Gromov converges to the polystable vortex (5.29) in the sense of Definition 1.7. This finishes the proof of the Gromov Compactness Theorem 1.8.

Appendix A. Useful formulas

In this appendix we provide some basic formulas that are needed for the calculations in Section 2. We start by considering almost complex structures on symplectic manifolds. For any manifold M we denote by $\mathrm{Vect}(M)$ the space of smooth vector fields on M.

Lemma A.1. *Let (M,ω) be a symplectic manifold, and let J be an ω-compatible almost complex structure. Denote by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle := \omega(\cdot, J\cdot)$ the Riemannian metric on M determined by ω and J, and let ∇ be the Levi-Civita connection on M associated to this metric. Then*

(i) $(\nabla_X J)J + J(\nabla_X J) = 0$

(ii) $J(\nabla_{JX} J) = \nabla_X J$

(iii) $\nabla_X(JY) = J\nabla_X Y + (\nabla_X J)Y$

(iv) $\big\langle(\nabla_X J)Y, Z\big\rangle + \big\langle Y, (\nabla_X J)Z\big\rangle = 0$

(v) $\big\langle(\nabla_X J)\,Y, Z\big\rangle + \big\langle(\nabla_Y J)\,Z, X\big\rangle + \big\langle(\nabla_Z J)X, Y\big\rangle = 0$

for $X, Y, Z \in \mathrm{Vect}(M)$. Let moreover $I \in \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM))$ be an arbitrary endomorphism of the tangent bundle of M. Then

(vi) $(\mathcal{L}_X I)Y = I\nabla_Y X + (\nabla_X I)Y - \nabla_{IY} X$

for $X, Y \in \mathrm{Vect}(M)$.

Proof. For (i)–(v), see Lemma C.7.1 in [16]. For (vi), see Exercise 2.1.1 in [16]. □

Next we specialize to the situation of Section 2. Let G be a compact Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ and assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is equipped with a G-invariant inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$. Let (M,ω,μ) be a compact Hamiltonian G-manifold with symplectic form ω and moment map $\mu\colon M \to \mathfrak{g}^* \cong \mathfrak{g}$, where we identify the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ with its dual $\mathfrak{g}^*$ by means of the invariant inner product on $\mathfrak{g}$. The action of G on M gives rise to an infinitesimal action of $\mathfrak{g}$ on M, and we denote by X_ξ the Hamiltonian vector field on M associated to the element $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}$. We will also us the notation

$$\mathrm{L}_x\colon \mathfrak{g} \longrightarrow T_xM, \qquad \xi \mapsto \mathrm{L}_x\xi$$

for the infinitesimal action of $\mathfrak{g}$ on M.

Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be an open subset of the complex plane. The remainder of this section is concerned with differential operators on certain function spaces over D. We begin by defining a twisted covariant derivative

$$\nabla_A\colon \Omega^0(D,\mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow \Omega^1(D,\mathfrak{g}), \qquad \nabla_A\eta := \mathrm{d}\eta + [A,\eta]$$

acting on smooth $\mathfrak{g}$-valued functions on D. It is compatible with the inner product on $\mathfrak{g}$ in the following sense.

Lemma A.2. *For all $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \Omega^0(D,\mathfrak{g})$, we have*

$$\mathrm{d}\langle\eta_1,\eta_2\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} = \langle\nabla_A\eta_1,\eta_2\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} + \langle\eta_1,\nabla_A\eta_2\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}.$$

Proof. Let $v \in TD$ be a tangent vector. By the Leibniz rule,

$$\mathrm{d}\langle \eta_1, \eta_2\rangle(v) = \langle \mathrm{d}\eta_1(v), \eta_2\rangle + \langle \eta_1, \mathrm{d}\eta_2(v)\rangle.$$

Moreover, G-invariance of the inner product on $\mathfrak{g}$ implies that

$$\big\langle [A(v), \eta_1], \eta_2\big\rangle + \big\langle \eta_1, [A(v), \eta_2]\big\rangle = 0.$$

Combining both identities, the claimed formula follows. ☐

Denote by $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ the space of smooth ω-compatible almost complex structures on M, and fix a smooth family

$$J \colon D \longrightarrow \mathcal{J}(M, \omega).$$

This family gives rise to a family

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot\rangle_J \colon D \ni z \longmapsto \langle \cdot, \cdot\rangle_z := \langle \cdot, \cdot\rangle_{J_z} = \omega(\cdot, J_z \cdot) \tag{A.1}$$

of Riemannian metrics on M. We shall denote the adjoint of the operator $\mathrm{L}_x \colon \mathfrak{g} \to T_xM$ with respect to the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ and the family of metrics $\langle \cdot, \cdot\rangle_J$ on M by

$$\mathrm{L}_x^* \colon T_xM \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}, \qquad v \mapsto \mathrm{L}_x^* v.$$

We then have the following formula for the twisted covariant derivative of the moment map μ.

Lemma A.3. *Let $u \in C^\infty(D, M)$. Then*

$$\nabla_A \mu(u) = -\mathrm{L}_u^* J \, \mathrm{d}_A u.$$

Proof. The proof is taken from [4], Section 9. Let $v \in TD$ be a tangent vector. A short calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{A,v}\mu(u) &= \mathrm{d}(\mu(u))(v) + [A(v), \mu(u)] \\ &= \mathrm{d}\mu(u)\big(\mathrm{d}u(v)\big) + \mathrm{d}\mu(u)(X_{A(v)}(u)) = \mathrm{d}\mu(u)\big(\mathrm{d}_A u(v)\big). \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

Moreover, the moment map property of μ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \big\langle \eta, \mathrm{L}_u^* \xi\big\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} &= \big\langle \mathrm{L}_u \eta, \xi\big\rangle_J \\ &= \omega\big(X_\eta(u), J\xi\big) \\ &= \mathrm{d}\langle \mu, \eta\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}}(J\xi) = \big\langle \mathrm{d}\mu(u)(J\xi), \eta\big\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\eta \in \Omega^0(D, \mathfrak{g})$ and $\xi \in \Omega^0(D, u^*TM)$. Hence $\mathrm{L}_u^* = \mathrm{d}\mu(u)J$, that is,

$$\mathrm{d}\mu(u) = -\mathrm{L}_u^* J.$$

On combining this with (A.2), the claim follows. ☐

Next we observe that the family (A.1) of Riemannian metrics on M determines a family

$$\nabla \colon D \ni z \longmapsto \nabla_z := \nabla_{J_z} \tag{A.3}$$

of associated Levi-Civita connections on M. Here ∇_z is the Levi-Civita connection

$$\nabla_z \colon \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)) \longrightarrow \Omega^1(M, \mathrm{End}(TM))$$

determined by the Riemannian metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{J_z}$.

Let us fix a smooth connection 1-form $A \in \Omega^1(D, \mathfrak{g})$ on D. Now A gives rise to a twisted covariant derivative

$$\nabla_A \colon \Omega^0(D, u^*TM) \longrightarrow \Omega^1(D, u^*TM), \qquad \nabla_A \xi = \nabla \xi + \nabla_\xi X_A(u)$$

acting on sections of the vector bundle $u^*TM \to D$. In more explicit terms, this operator is given by

$$\nabla_A \xi\,(z) = \big(\nabla_z \xi\big)(z) + \big((\nabla_z)_{\xi(z)} X_A(u)\big)(z)$$

for $z \in B$. Furthermore, we define a twisted covariant derivative

$$\delta_A \colon \Omega^0\big(D, \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM))\big) \longrightarrow \Omega^1\big(D, \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM))\big)$$

acting on families $D \to \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM))$ by

$$\delta_A I := \mathrm{d} I - \mathcal{L}_{X_A} I,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{X_A} I$ is the Lie derivative of I along the vector field X_A. In more explicit terms, the 1-form $\delta_A I$ is given by

$$\delta_A I\,(v) = \mathrm{d}I(v) - \mathcal{L}_{X_{A(v)}} I_z$$

for $z \in B$ and $v \in T_z B$. In particular, $\mathcal{L}_{X_{A(v)}} I_z$ denotes the Lie derivative of the endomorphism I_z in the direction of the vector field $X_{A(v)}$ on M.

The next result collects some basic properties of the operator δ_A.

Lemma A.4. *Let $J \colon D \to \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ be a smooth family of ω-compatible almost complex structures on M with associated family of Riemannian metrics $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_J = \omega(\cdot, J\cdot)$. Let $A \in \Omega^1(D, \mathfrak{g})$ be a connection 1-form. Let $u \in C^\infty(D, M)$, and let $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \Omega^0(D, u^*TM)$ be sections. Then*

(i) $J(\delta_A J) + (\delta_A J) J = 0$

(ii) $\big\langle \xi_1, J(\delta_A J)\xi_2 \big\rangle - \big\langle J(\delta_A J)\xi_1, \xi_2 \big\rangle = 0$

(iii) $\big\langle \xi_1, (\delta_A J)\xi_2 \big\rangle - \big\langle (\delta_A J)\xi_1, \xi_2 \big\rangle = 0.$

Proof. First recall that the twisted covariant derivative δ_A is defined by

$$\delta_A J = \mathrm{d}J - \mathcal{L}_{X_A} J.$$

Proof of (i). This follows from $J^2 = \mathrm{Id}$ by the Leibniz rule. More precisely, we have

$$0 = \mathrm{d}\big(J^2\big) = (\mathrm{d}J)J + J(\mathrm{d}J)$$

and

$$0 = \mathcal{L}_{X_A}\big(J^2\big) = (\mathcal{L}_{X_A} J)J + J(\mathcal{L}_{X_A} J).$$

Combining both identities, the claimed formula follows.

Proof of (ii). For $z \in B$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\big\langle \xi_1(z), J_z(\mathrm{d}J_z)\,\xi_2(z)\big\rangle_z &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial z'}\langle \xi_1(z), \xi_2(z)\rangle_{z'}\Big|_{z'=z}\\ &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial z'}\langle \xi_2(z), \xi_1(z)\rangle_{z'}\Big|_{z'=z}\\ &= \big\langle \xi_2(z), J_z(\mathrm{d}J_z)\,\xi_1(z)\big\rangle_z = \big\langle J_z(\mathrm{d}J_z)\,\xi_1(z), \xi_2(z)\big\rangle_z,\end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\langle \xi_1, J(\mathrm{d}J)\xi_2\rangle = \langle J(\mathrm{d}J)\xi_1, \xi_2\rangle.$$

On the other hand note that, by G-invariance of ω, we have $\mathcal{L}_{X_A}\omega = 0$. Using this, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle J(\mathcal{L}_{X_A}J)\xi_1, \xi_2\rangle &= \omega\big((\mathcal{L}_{X_A}J)\xi_1, \xi_2\big)\\ &= (\mathcal{L}_{X_A}\omega)(J\xi_1, \xi_2) - \mathcal{L}_{X_A}\big(\omega(J\xi_1, \xi_2)\big) - \omega\big(J(\mathcal{L}_{X_A}\xi_1), \xi_2\big)\\ &\quad - \omega\big(J\xi_1, \mathcal{L}_{X_A}\xi_2\big)\\ &= -\mathcal{L}_{X_A}\big(\omega(J\xi_1, \xi_2)\big) - \omega\big(J(\mathcal{L}_{X_A}\xi_1), \xi_2\big) - \omega\big(J(\mathcal{L}_{X_A}\xi_2), \xi_1\big)\\ &= -\mathcal{L}_{X_A}\big(\omega(J\xi_2, \xi_1)\big) - \omega\big(J(\mathcal{L}_{X_A}\xi_2), \xi_1\big) - \omega\big(J(\mathcal{L}_{X_A}\xi_1), \xi_2\big)\\ &= (\mathcal{L}_{X_A}\omega)(J\xi_2, \xi_1) - \mathcal{L}_{X_A}\big(\omega(J\xi_2, \xi_1)\big) - \omega\big(J(\mathcal{L}_{X_A}\xi_2), \xi_1\big)\\ &\quad + \omega\big(J(\mathcal{L}_{X_A}\xi_1), \xi_2\big)\\ &= \omega\big((\mathcal{L}_{X_A}J)\xi_2, \xi_1\big)\\ &= \langle \xi_1, J(\mathcal{L}_{X_A}J)\xi_2\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

The formulas for the Lie derivatives that we used in this computation may be found in [13, p. 34 and Prop. 3.2(a)]. Combining both identities, the claimed formula follows.

Proof of (iii). This is a direct consequence of Formulas (i) and (ii) above. For, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \xi_1, (\delta_A J)\xi_2\rangle &= \langle J\xi_1, J(\delta_A J)\xi_2\rangle\\ &= -\langle J\xi_1, (\delta_A J)J\xi_2\rangle\\ &= -\langle (\delta_A J)\xi_1, J^2\xi_2\rangle = \langle (\delta_A J)\xi_1, \xi_2\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

□

The next proposition provides a Leibniz rule for the operator ∇_A.

Proposition A.5. *Let $J\colon D \to \mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$ be a smooth family of ω-compatible almost complex structures on M with associated family of Riemannian metrics $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_J = \omega(\cdot, J\cdot)$. Let $A \in \Omega^1(D,\mathfrak{g})$ be a connection 1-form. Let $u \in C^\infty(D,M)$ and let $\xi \in \Omega^0(D, u^*TM)$ be a section. Let $I \in \Omega^0(D, \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)))$. Then*

$$\nabla_A(I\xi) = I\nabla_A\xi + \big(\nabla_{\mathrm{d}_A u}I\big)\xi + \big(\delta_A I\big)\xi.$$

Proof. Let $v \in TD$ be a tangent vector. Using the Leibniz rule we compute

$$\nabla_v(I\xi) = I\nabla_v\xi + (\nabla_{\mathrm{d}u(v)}I)\xi + \mathrm{d}I(v)\,\xi.$$

By Lemma A.1 (vi) we further have

$$\nabla_{I\xi}X_{A(v)} = I\nabla_\xi X_{A(v)} + \big(\nabla_{X_{A(v)}}I\big)\xi - \big(\mathcal{L}_{X_{A(v)}}I\big)\xi.$$

Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{A,v}(I\xi) &= \nabla_v(I\xi) + \nabla_{I\xi}X_{A(v)}\\ &= I\nabla_v\xi + I\nabla_\xi X_{A(v)} + (\nabla_{\mathrm{d}u(v)}I)\xi + (\nabla_{X_{A(v)}}I)\xi + \mathrm{d}I(v)\,\xi - (\mathcal{L}_{X_{A(v)}}I)\xi\\ &= I\big(\nabla_v\xi + \nabla_\xi X_{A(v)}\big) + \big(\nabla_{\mathrm{d}u(v)+X_{A(v)}}I\big)\xi + \big(\,\mathrm{d}I(v) - \mathcal{L}_{X_{A(v)}}I\big)\xi\\ &= I\nabla_{A,v}\xi + (\nabla_{\mathrm{d}_A u(v)}I)\xi + (\delta_{A,v}I)\xi.\end{aligned}$$

□

The next proposition makes precise the sense in which the operator ∇_A is compatible with the Riemannian metric $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_J$ on M.

Proposition A.6. *Let $J\colon D \to \mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$ be a smooth family of ω-compatible almost complex structures on M with associated Riemannian metric $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_J = \omega(\cdot, J\cdot)$. Let $A \in \Omega^1(D,\mathfrak{g})$ be a connection 1-form. Let $u \in C^\infty(D,M)$, and let $\xi_1,\xi_2 \in \Omega^0(D,u^*TM)$ be sections. Then*

$$\mathrm{d}\langle\xi_1,\xi_2\rangle = \langle\nabla_A\xi_1,\xi_2\rangle + \langle\xi_1,\nabla_A\xi_2\rangle + \langle J\xi_1,(\delta_A J)\xi_2\rangle.$$

The proof of Proposition A.6 is based on the following two lemmas.

Lemma A.7. *Under the assumptions of Proposition A.6 we have*

$$\mathrm{d}\langle\xi_1,\xi_2\rangle = \langle\nabla\xi_1,\xi_2\rangle + \langle\xi_1,\nabla\xi_2\rangle + \langle J\xi_1,(\mathrm{d}J)\xi_2\rangle.$$

Proof. First recall that the function $\langle\xi_1,\xi_2\rangle\colon D \to \mathbb{R}$ is given explicitly by $\langle\xi_1,\xi_2\rangle(z) = \langle\xi_1(z),\xi_2(z)\rangle_z$ for $z \in D$. Whence

$$\mathrm{d}_z\langle\xi_1,\xi_2\rangle = \frac{\partial}{\partial z'}\big\langle\xi_1(z'),\xi_2(z')\big\rangle_z\Big|_{z'=z} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z'}\big\langle\xi_1(z),\xi_2(z)\big\rangle_{z'}\Big|_{z'=z} \tag{A.4}$$

The first term on the right-hand side of this expression is computed using pointwise compatibility of the family of Levi-Civita connections ∇_z with the family of metrics $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{J_z}$ on M. So

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial z'}\big\langle\xi_1(z'),\xi_2(z')\big\rangle_z\Big|_{z'=z} &= \big\langle\nabla_z\xi_1(z'),\xi_2(z')\big\rangle_z + \big\langle\xi_1(z'),\nabla_z\xi_2(z')\big\rangle_z\Big|_{z'=z}\\ &= \big\langle\nabla_z\xi_1(z),\xi_2(z)\big\rangle_z + \big\langle\xi_1(z),\nabla_z\xi_2(z)\big\rangle_z.\end{aligned}$$

For the second term we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial z'}\big\langle \xi_1(z), \xi_2(z)\big\rangle_{z'}\bigg|_{z'=z} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial z'}\,\omega_{u(z)}\big(\xi_1(z), I_{z'}\,\xi_2(z)\big)\bigg|_{z'=z}\\ &= \omega_{u(z)}\big(\xi_1(z), (\mathrm{d}J)(z)\,\xi_2(z)\big)\\ &= -\omega_{u(z)}\big(\xi_1(z), J_z^2\,(\mathrm{d}J)(z)\,\xi_2(z)\big)\\ &= \big\langle J_z\xi_1(z), (\mathrm{d}J)(z)\,\xi_2(z)\big\rangle_z.\end{aligned}$$

Combining both results we obtain

$$\mathrm{d}_z\langle \xi_1, \xi_2\rangle = \big\langle \nabla_z\xi_1(z), \xi_2(z)\big\rangle_z + \big\langle \xi_1(z), \nabla_z\xi_2(z)\big\rangle_z + \big\langle J_z\,\xi_1(z), (\mathrm{d}J)(z)\,\xi_2(z)\big\rangle_z.$$

□

Lemma A.8. *Let $h \in C^\infty_G(M, \mathbb{R})$ be a Hamiltonian function on M, with Hamiltonian vector field $X_h \in C^\infty_G(M, TM)$. Then, under the assumptions of Proposition A.6,*

$$\langle \xi_1, \nabla_{\xi_2}X_h\rangle + \langle \nabla_{\xi_1}X_h, \xi_2\rangle + \langle J\xi_1, (\mathcal{L}_{X_h}J)\,\xi_2\rangle = 0.$$

Proof. The proof is adapted from the proof of Lemma B.2 in [4]. We first write

$$\langle \xi_1, \nabla_{\xi_2}X_h\rangle + \langle \nabla_{\xi_1}X_h, \xi_2\rangle = \langle J\xi_1, J\nabla_{\xi_2}X_h\rangle + \langle J\nabla_{\xi_1}X_h, J\xi_2\rangle.$$

Using the formulas

$$J\nabla_{\xi_2}X_h = \nabla_{J\xi_2}X_h - (\nabla_{X_h}J)\xi_2 + (\mathcal{L}_{X_h}J)\xi_2$$

and

$$J\nabla_{\xi_1}X_h = \nabla_{\xi_1}(JX_h) - (\nabla_{\xi_1}J)X_h,$$

which hold by Lemma A.1 (vi) and (iii), and rearranging terms we get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \xi_1, \nabla_{\xi_2}X_h\rangle + \langle \nabla_{\xi_1}X_h, \xi_2\rangle = {}& \langle J\xi_1, \nabla_{J\xi_2}X_h\rangle + \langle \nabla_{\xi_1}(JX_h), J\xi_2\rangle - \langle J\xi_1, (\nabla_{X_h}J)\xi_2\rangle\\ &- \langle (\nabla_{\xi_1}J)X_h, J\xi_2\rangle + \langle J\xi_1, (\mathcal{L}_{X_h}J)\xi_2\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

We simplify this using

$$\langle J\xi_1, (\nabla_{X_h}J)\xi_2\rangle = -\langle \xi_1, J(\nabla_{X_h}J)\xi_2\rangle = \langle \xi_1, (\nabla_{X_h}J)J\xi_2\rangle$$

from Lemma A.1 (i), obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \xi_1, \nabla_{\xi_2}X_h\rangle + \langle \nabla_{\xi_1}X_h, \xi_2\rangle = {}& \langle \nabla_{\xi_1}(JX_h), J\xi_2\rangle + \langle J\xi_1, \nabla_{J\xi_2}X_h\rangle - \big(\langle (\nabla_{\xi_1}J)X_h, J\xi_2\rangle\\ &+ \langle \xi_1, (\nabla_{X_h}J)J\xi_2\rangle\big) + \langle J\xi_1, (\mathcal{L}_{X_h}J)\xi_2\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.1 (v),

$$\langle (\nabla_{\xi_1}J)X_h, J\xi_2\rangle + \langle (\nabla_{X_h}J)J\xi_2, \xi_1\rangle + \langle (\nabla_{J\xi_2}J)\xi_1, X_h\rangle = 0.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \xi_1, \nabla_{\xi_2}X_h\rangle + \langle \nabla_{\xi_1}X_h, \xi_2\rangle = {}& \langle \nabla_{\xi_1}(JX_h), J\xi_2\rangle + \langle J\xi_1, \nabla_{J\xi_2}X_h\rangle + \langle (\nabla_{J\xi_2}J)\xi_1, X_h\rangle\\ &+ \langle J\xi_1, (\mathcal{L}_{X_h}J)\xi_2\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Since X_h is the Hamiltonian vector field of h we have

$$\mathrm{d}h = \omega(X_h, \cdot) = \langle JX_h, \cdot \rangle,$$

that is, $JX_h = \nabla h$ is the gradient vector field of h. But then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla_{\xi_1}(JX_h), J\xi_2 \rangle &= \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} \nabla h, J\xi_2 \rangle \\ &= \nabla\, \mathrm{d}h(\xi_1, J\xi_2) \\ &= \nabla\, \mathrm{d}h(J\xi_2, \xi_1) \\ &= \langle \nabla_{J\xi_2} \nabla h, \xi_1 \rangle = \langle \nabla_{J\xi_2}(JX_h), \xi_1 \rangle = \langle \xi_1, \nabla_{J\xi_2}(JX_h) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

since the Hessian $\nabla\, \mathrm{d}h$ is symmetric. Moreover, by Lemma A.1 (iv),

$$\langle (\nabla_{J\xi_2} J)\xi_1, X_h \rangle = -\langle \xi_1, (\nabla_{J\xi_2} J) X_h \rangle.$$

Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \xi_1, \nabla_{\xi_2} X_h \rangle + \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} X_h, \xi_2 \rangle = {}& \langle \xi_1, \nabla_{J\xi_2}(JX_h) - J\nabla_{J\xi_2} X_h - (\nabla_{J\xi_2} J) X_h \rangle \\ &+ \langle J\xi_1, (\mathcal{L}_{X_h} J)\xi_2 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Using

$$\nabla_{J\xi_2}(JX_h) - J\nabla_{J\xi_2} X_h - (\nabla_{J\xi_2} J) X_h = 0$$

from Lemma A.1 (iii) we finally obtain

$$\langle \xi_1, \nabla_{\xi_2} X_h \rangle + \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} X_h, \xi_2 \rangle = \langle J\xi_1, (\mathcal{L}_{X_h} J)\xi_2 \rangle.$$

□

We are now ready to prove Proposition A.6.

Proof of Proposition A.6: First note that

$$\langle \nabla_A \xi_1, \xi_2 \rangle = \langle \nabla \xi_1, \xi_2 \rangle + \langle \nabla_{\xi_1} X_A(u), \xi_2 \rangle$$

and

$$\langle \xi_1, \nabla_A \xi_2 \rangle = \langle \xi_1, \nabla \xi_2 \rangle + \langle \xi_1, \nabla_{\xi_2} X_A(u) \rangle.$$

Using Lemma A.7 we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}\langle \xi_1, \xi_2 \rangle = {}& \langle \nabla_A \xi_1, \xi_2 \rangle + \langle \xi_1, \nabla_A \xi_2 \rangle - \big(\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} X_A(u), \xi_2 \rangle + \langle \xi_1, \nabla_{\xi_2} X_A(u) \rangle \big) \\ &+ \langle J\xi_1, (\mathrm{d}J)\xi_2 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

To compute the third term on the right-hand side of this expression, we note that for every tangent vector $v \in TD$, $X_{A(v)}(u)$ is a Hamiltonian vector field on M along u associated to the Hamiltonian function $\langle \mu, A(v) \rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} \in C^\infty_G(M, \mathbb{R})$. So Lemma A.8 yields

$$\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} X_{A(v)}(u), \xi_2 \rangle + \langle \xi_1, \nabla_{\xi_2} X_{A(v)}(u) \rangle = \langle J\xi_1, (\mathcal{L}_{X_{A(v)}} J)\, \xi_2 \rangle = -\langle \xi_1, J(\mathcal{L}_{X_{A(v)}} J)\, \xi_2 \rangle$$

for $v \in TD$. Whence

$$\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} X_A(u), \xi_2 \rangle + \langle \xi_1, \nabla_{\xi_2} X_A(u) \rangle = \langle J\xi_1, (\mathcal{L}_{X_A} J)\, \xi_2 \rangle.$$

Rearranging terms we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}\langle \xi_1, \xi_2\rangle &= \langle \nabla_A \xi_1, \xi_2\rangle + \langle \xi_1, \nabla_A \xi_2\rangle + \big\langle J\xi_1, \big(\mathrm{d}J - \mathcal{L}_{X_A} J\big)\xi_2\big\rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla_A \xi_1, \xi_2\rangle + \langle \xi_1, \nabla_A \xi_2\rangle + \langle J\xi_1, (\delta_A J)\xi_2\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Proposition A.6.

We now define a $\mathfrak{g}$-valued bilinear form $\rho\colon u^*TM \otimes u^*TM \to \mathfrak{g}$ on the vector bundle $u^*TM \to D$ by the relation

$$\big\langle \eta, \rho(\xi_1, \xi_2)\big\rangle_{\mathfrak{g}} = \big\langle \nabla_{\xi_1} X_\eta(u), \xi_2\big\rangle_J$$

for $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \Omega^0(D, u^*TM)$ and $\eta \in \Omega^0(D, \mathfrak{g})$. We have the following result.

Lemma A.9. *Let $u \in C^\infty(D, M)$, let $\eta \in \Omega^0(D, \mathfrak{g})$ and let $\xi \in \Omega^0(D, u^*TM)$ be a section. Then*

(i) $\nabla_A \mathrm{L}_u \eta - \mathrm{L}_u \nabla_A \eta = \nabla_{\mathrm{d}_A u} X_\eta(u)$

(ii) $\nabla_A \mathrm{L}_u^* \xi - \mathrm{L}_u^* \nabla_A \xi = \rho(\mathrm{d}_A u, \xi) - \mathrm{L}_u^* J(\delta_A J)\xi.$

Proof. Proof of (i). Let $v \in TD$ be a tangent vector. Because the Levi-Civita connection ∇ is torsion free, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla_{A,v}(\mathrm{L}_u \eta) - \mathrm{L}_u \nabla_{A,v}\eta \\ &= \nabla_v \mathrm{L}_u \eta + \nabla_{X_{\eta}(u)} X_\Phi(u) - \mathrm{L}_u\big(\mathrm{d}\eta(v) + [A(v), \eta]\big) \\ &= \nabla_{\mathrm{d}u(v)} X_\eta(u) + \mathrm{L}_u(\mathrm{d}\eta(v)) + \nabla_{X_{A(v)}(u)} X_\eta(u) + X_{[A(v),\eta]}(u) \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad - \mathrm{L}_u(\mathrm{d}\eta(v)) - X_{[A(v),\eta]}(u) \\ &= \nabla_{\mathrm{d}u(v)} X_\eta(u) + \nabla_{X_{A(v)}(u)} X_\eta(u) \\ &= \nabla_{\mathrm{d}_A u(v)} X_\eta(u). \end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

Proof of (ii). Our proof builds on the proof of Lemma C.2 in [4]. Let $v \in TD$ be a tangent vector. Using Lemmas A.2 and A.6 we compute

$$\begin{aligned} &\big\langle \eta, \nabla_{A,v}(\mathrm{L}_u^* \xi) - \mathrm{L}_u^* \nabla_{A,v}\xi\big\rangle \\ &= \mathrm{d}\langle \eta, \mathrm{L}_u^*\xi\rangle(v) - \langle \nabla_{A,v}\eta, \mathrm{L}_u^*\xi\rangle - \langle \eta, \mathrm{L}_u^* \nabla_{A,s}\xi\rangle \\ &= \mathrm{d}\langle \mathrm{L}_u\eta, \xi\rangle(v) - \langle \mathrm{L}_u \nabla_{A,v}\eta, \xi\rangle - \langle \mathrm{L}_u\eta, \nabla_{A,v}\xi\rangle \\ &= \mathrm{d}\langle \mathrm{L}_u\eta, \xi\rangle(v) - \langle \mathrm{L}_u \nabla_{A,v}\eta, \xi\rangle - \mathrm{d}\langle \mathrm{L}_u\eta, \xi\rangle(v) + \langle \nabla_{A,v}(\mathrm{L}_u\eta), \xi\rangle - \langle \mathrm{L}_u\eta, J(\delta_{A,v}J)\xi\rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla_{A,v}(\mathrm{L}_u\eta) - \mathrm{L}_u\nabla_{A,v}\eta, \xi\rangle - \langle \eta, \mathrm{L}_u^* J(\delta_{A,v}J)\xi)\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We may simplify this further using Formula (A.5). By definition of the bilinear form ρ we thus get

$$\begin{aligned} \big\langle \eta, \nabla_{A,v} \mathrm{L}_u^*\xi - \mathrm{L}_u^*\nabla_{A,v}\xi\big\rangle &= \big\langle \nabla_{\mathrm{d}_A u(v)} X_\eta(u), \xi\big\rangle + \big\langle \mathrm{L}_u^* J(\delta_{A,v}J)\xi\big\rangle \\ &= \big\langle \eta, \rho(\mathrm{d}_A u(v), \xi) + \mathrm{L}_u^* J(\delta_{A,v}J)\xi\big\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

□

We close the appendix with Proposition A.10 below, which states a Weitzenböck type identity for the operator ∇_A. As we shall see, in this context it will be convenient to think of the family (A.3) of Levi-Civita connections on M in the following way. Fix a reference connection ∇_0 on M and write the affine linear space of all connections on M as

$$\nabla_0 + \Omega^1(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)).$$

Define a map

$$\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}} \colon \mathcal{J}(M, \omega) \longrightarrow \nabla_0 + \Omega^1(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)), \quad I \mapsto \nabla_I \tag{A.6}$$

that assigns to every ω-compatible almost complex structure I on M the Levi-Civita connection of the Riemannian metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_I := \omega(\cdot, I\cdot)$. The family (A.3) is then given by

$$\nabla \colon D \longrightarrow \nabla_0 + \Omega^1(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)), \quad z \mapsto \nabla_{J_z},$$

where $J \colon D \to \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ is the fixed family of almost complex structures on M. We define the twisted derivative of the family ∇ as follows. Denote by

$$\mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}} \colon \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)) \longrightarrow \Omega^1(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)), \quad I \mapsto \mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}}(I)$$

the derivative of the map (A.6), and recall that the twisted derivative of the family $J \colon D \to \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ is given by

$$\delta_A J \colon TD \longrightarrow \Omega^0(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)).$$

We then define the twisted derivative of the family (A.3) to be the map

$$\mathrm{D}_A \nabla := \mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}} \circ \delta_A J \colon TD \longrightarrow \Omega^1(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)). \tag{A.7}$$

The evaluation of this differential on a tangent vector $v \in TD$ will be denoted by

$$\mathrm{D}_{A,v} \nabla = \mathrm{d}\nabla^{\mathrm{LC}}\big(\delta_{A,v} J\big) \in \Omega^1(M, \mathrm{End}(TM)).$$

Furthermore, we denote by

$$R \colon D \ni z \mapsto R_z \in \Omega^2(M, \mathrm{End}(TM))$$

the family of Riemann curvature tensors on M associated to the family of Levi-Civita connections (A.3). We shall use the abbreviations

$$\nabla_{A,s} := \nabla_{A,\partial s}, \quad \nabla_{A,t} := \nabla_{A,\partial t}, \quad v_s := \mathrm{d}_A u(\partial s), \quad v_t := \mathrm{d}_A u(\partial t),$$

where ∂s and ∂t are the coordinate vector fields on D.

With this notation we may now state the Weitzenböck type identity for ∇_A.

Proposition A.10. *Let $J \colon D \to \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ be a smooth family of ω-compatible almost complex structures on M. Let $A \in \Omega^1(D, \mathfrak{g})$ be a connection 1-form. Let $u \in C^\infty(D, M)$, and let $\xi \in \Omega^0(D, u^*TM)$ be a section. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\nabla_{A,s}\nabla_{A,t} - \nabla_{A,t}\nabla_{A,s}\big)\xi = R(v_s, v_t)\xi + \nabla_\xi X_{F_A(\partial_s, \partial_t)}(u) \\ + \big((\mathrm{D}_{A,s}\nabla)(v_t) - (\mathrm{D}_{A,t}\nabla)(v_s)\big)\xi.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the Leibniz rule,

$$\nabla_{A,v}(\nabla_{A,w}\xi) = \nabla_{A,v}\big((\nabla_z)_{A,w}\xi\big) + \mathrm{D}_{A,v}\nabla\big(\mathrm{d}_A u(w_z)\big)\xi$$

for $z \in D$, $v \in T_zD$ and $w \in \mathrm{Vect}(D)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\nabla_{A,s}\nabla_{A,t} - \nabla_{A,t}\nabla_{A,s}\big)\xi = \nabla_{A,s}\big((\nabla_z)_{A,t}\xi\big) - \nabla_{A,t}\big((\nabla_z)_{A,s}\xi\big)&\\ + \big((\mathrm{D}_{A,s}\nabla)(v_t) - (\mathrm{D}_{A,t}\nabla)(v_s)\big)\xi.&\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma B.4 in [4] we now have

$$\nabla_{A,s}\big((\nabla_z)_{A,t}\xi\big) - \nabla_{A,t}\big((\nabla_z)_{A,s}\xi\big) = R(v_s, v_t)\xi + \nabla_\xi X_{F_A(\partial_s,\partial_t)}(u).$$

□

References

1. K. Cieliebak, A. R. Gaio, I. Mundet i Riera, and D. A. Salamon, *The symplectic vortex equations and invariants of Hamiltonian group actions*, J. Symplectic Geom. **1** (2002), no. 3, 543–645.
2. K. Cieliebak, A. R. Gaio, and D. A. Salamon, *J-holomorphic curves, moment maps, and invariants of Hamiltonian group actions*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (2000), no. 16, 831–882.
3. U. Frauenfelder, *The Arnold-Givental conjecture and moment Floer homology*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2004), no. 42, 2179–2269.
4. A. R. Gaio and D. A. Salamon, *Gromov-Witten invariants of symplectic quotients and adiabatic limits*, J. Symplectic Geom. **3** (2005), no. 1, 55–159.
5. E. González, A. Ott, C. Woodward, and F. Ziltener, *Symplectic vortices with fixed holonomy at infinity*, Preprint, 2009.
6. E. González and C. Woodward, *Area dependence in gauged Gromov-Witten theory*, `arXiv:0811.3358v2 [math.SG]` (2008).
7. ———, *Gauged Gromov-Witten theory for small spheres*, `arXiv:0907.3869v1 [math.SG]` (2009).
8. M. Gromov, *Pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds*, Invent. Math. **82** (1985), no. 2, 307–347.
9. V. Guillemin and S. Sternberg, *Supersymmetry and equivariant de Rham theory*, Mathematics Past and Present, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999, With an appendix containing two reprints by Henri Cartan.
10. H. Hofer and D. A. Salamon, *Floer homology and Novikov rings*, The Floer memorial volume, Progr. Math., vol. 133, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995, pp. 483–524.
11. C. Hummel, *Gromov's compactness theorem for pseudo-holomorphic curves*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 151, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1997.
12. S. Ivashkovich and V. Shevchishin, *Gromov compactness theorem for J-complex curves with boundary*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (2000), no. 22, 1167–1206.
13. S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu, *Foundations of differential geometry. Vol. I*, John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1996.
14. M. Kontsevich, *Enumeration of rational curves via torus actions*, The moduli space of curves (Texel Island, 1994), Progr. Math., vol. 129, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1995, pp. 335–368.
15. D. McDuff and D. A. Salamon, *Introduction to symplectic topology*, second ed., Oxford Mathematical Monographs, The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1998.
16. ———, *J-holomorphic curves and symplectic topology*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, vol. 52, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.

17. I. Mundet i Riera, *A Hitchin-Kobayashi correspondence for Kähler fibrations*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **528** (2000), 41–80.
18. ———, *Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants*, Topology **42** (2003), no. 3, 525–553.
19. I. Mundet i Riera and G. Tian, *A compactification of the moduli space of twisted holomorphic maps*, `arXiv:math/0404407v1 [math.SG]`.
20. T. Parker and J. Wolfson, *Pseudo-holomorphic maps and bubble trees*, J. Geom. Anal. **3** (1993), no. 1, 63–98.
21. B. Siebert and G. Tian, *Lectures on pseudo-holomorphic curves and the symplectic isotopy problem*, Symplectic 4-manifolds and algebraic surfaces, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1938, Springer, Berlin, 2008, pp. 269–341.
22. K. Wehrheim, *Uhlenbeck compactness*, EMS Series of Lectures in Mathematics, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2004.
23. ———, *Energy quantization and mean value inequalities for nonlinear boundary value problems*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **7** (2005), no. 3, 305–318.
24. R. Ye, *Gromov's compactness theorem for pseudo holomorphic curves*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **342** (1994), no. 2, 671–694.
25. K. Yosida, *Functional analysis*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 123, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980.
26. F. Ziltener, *Symplectic vortices on the complex plane and quantum cohomology*, Ph.D. thesis, ETH Zürich, 2006.
27. ———, *The invariant symplectic action and decay for vortices*, J. Symplectic Geom. **7** (2009), no. 3, 357–376.

Departement Mathematik, ETH Zürich, Rämistrasse 101, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland
E-mail address: `andreas@math.ethz.ch`